DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 759 SO 018 737

AUTHOR	DiMaggio, Paul; Ostrower, Francie
TITLE	Race, Ethnicity and Participation in the Arts: Patterns of Participation by Black, Hispanic and White Americans in Selected Activities from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts.
INSTITUTION	National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 87
CONTRACT	NEA-C86-192
NOTE	290p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art Activities; *Blacks; Comparative Analysis; Ethnicity; *Hispanic Americans; National Surveys; *Participation; *Race; Racial Differences; Racial Factors; Social Science Research; *Whites
IDENTIFIERS	*Survey of Public Participation in the Arts

ABSTRACT

This report utilizes data from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts to describe differences in patterns of participation in selected arts related activities by Black, Hispanic, and White respondents. Arts participation by Whites is greatest for all selected activities, except for Black attendance at jazz music activities. For most activities, absolute differences are relatively small, and net differences between Blacks and Whites are more marked for visually oriented art than for performing arts activities. Hispanics participate at rates similar to those of socioeconomically comparable Whites. Differences associated with race are small compared to those associated with educational attainment, income, occupational prestige, and gender; and socioeconomic factors are principal participation barriers for Blacks and Hispanics. Intergroup differences are smaller for younger than for older respondents and appear to be the result of an increase in the number of years of schooling of younger Black and Hispanic respondents. Suggestions for further research are offered, and an appendix contains tables of the surveys' statistical data. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293759

RACE, ETHNICITY AND PARTICIPATION IN THE ARTS: PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION BY BLACK, HISPANIC AND WHITE AMERICANS IN SELECTED ACTIVITIES FROM THE 1982 AND 1985 SURVEYS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE ARTS

Paul DiMaggio and Francie Ostrower
Yale University
June 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO018737

Report to the National Endowment for the Arts. Research Division under Contract No. C86-192.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Chapter 1: Race Ethnicity and Participation in the Arts	1
Chapter 2: Rates of Participation by Race and Ethnicity	27
Chapter 3: Net Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Participation in SPPA Core Activities	62
Chapter 4: Racial/Ethnic Differences in Unsated Demand for Participation	91
Chapter 5: Evidence on Racial and Ethnic Differences in Participation from the November/December Subsample	111
Chapter 6: Conclusions	149
Appendix: Other Tables	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report uses data from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) to describe and explain differences in patterns of participation in selected artistic activities by Black. Hispanic and white respondents. The surveys permit generalization to national populations of white and Black Americans. because the SPPAs were designed to be nationally representative of the American population with respect to age. gender. and race. Because the sample was not designed to be representative with respect to Hispanic origin or other ethnic categories. conclusions about the participation of Hispanic Americans must be more tentative. Asian Americans were identifiable only in the 1985 data. but too few were included in the sample to permit generalization about this group. Native Americans were not identified separately. thus making analysis of their participation impossible.

Data on socioeconomic and demographic background and on participation in ten "core" activities were collected from all respondents in both years. The core activities were: attending jazz. classical music. opera. musical theatre. straight theatre. and ballet performances. visiting art museums or exhibits. reading works of imaginative literature. playing a musical instrument in public and dancing or singing or acting on stage. The SPPAS also asked subsamples of respondents each year about: participation in "other" acti-

vities. including visits to historical or science museums or monuments. reading poetry. taking arts lessons. painting or drawing engaging in various craft activities. and working backstage in the performing arts; consumption of arts programming on television. radio. or sound recording; desire for additional participation in the core activities and reasons for not participating more; socialization into the arts as children in the home and specific kinds of art lessons taken throughout the respondent's life; and attitudes towards 13 genres of music.

Descriptive statistics on the core questions were derived from analyses of the full samples for both years; descriptive statistics on the other questions were derived from analyses of the appropriate subsamples of whom these questions were asked for both years; and multivariate analyses employing data from two or more of the intermittently asked questions are based on data from November and December 1982. the only months during which the same respondents were asked all of the questions.

Differences in Participation

SPPA Core Activities. With the exception of attendance at jazz concerts. for which that of Black respondents exceeded that of white or Hispanics. white respondents participated more in all of the core activities than did Black or Hispanic respondents. Most absolute differences between groups with respect to core activities were relatively small. with spreads of from one tenth of one percent

(Hispanic ballet attendance in 1982) to. at most. almost 24 percent (Hispanic fiction reading in 1982) between minority groups and the white majority. Most absolute percentage differences were low in large part because. except for reading imaginative literature. relatively few members of any group participated in core activities.

If one looks not at absolute margins between the percentages of groups participating. but rather at the ratio of proportions participating for different groups (odds ratios) for some activities the differences in rates of participation for whites. on the one hand. and Blacks and Hispanics. on the other. were sizable. For example. in both years whites were more than twice as likely as Blacks to report attending a classical-music concert. an opera performance. a musical-theatre performance. a play. or a ballet. Non-Hispanic whites were also more than twice as likely as Americans of Hispanic origin to report attending a play (in both years) and in 1985 attending a classical-music concert or an opera performance./1

Rates of public performance (on musical instruments or by singing. dancing. or acting) were lower than those for attendance at arts events for members of all groups. Differences between whites and other groups were smaller for

1/ For the sake of simplicity. we drop the modifier "non-Hispanic" when referring to whites and Blacks throughout this report. The reader should recognize that this modifier is implicit.

these art-producing activities than for most other core consumption activities.

Other activities. Whites were substantially more likely to visit museums or exhibits than Hispanics. who were somewhat more likely to do so than Blacks. Differences between Black and whites rates were substantial for visiting history or science museums. historical monuments. and arts or craft fairs. White respondents were also substantially more likely than others to engage in needlework crafts. and much more likely than Blacks to participate in other crafts activities. By contrast. whites were only somewhat more likely than others to have read or listened to poetry. taken art lessons. or engaged in painting and drawing. photography or film. although for some of these Black and Hispanic proportions fluctuated between 1982 and 1985. (For example. Hispanics in 1982 were more likely to report creative writing than whites. whereas they were less likely than Blacks or whites to indicate participating in this activity in 1985.)

Evidence from the core and other activities indicates that minority-group members were less likely to attend cultural institutions. relative whites. than to be found in the ranks of amateur creative artists. Nonetheless. the tendency of white Americans to participate at higher rates than others manifested itself in responses to most of these questions. The exception of jazz. for which Black attendance rates were well above those of whites or Hispanics. indicates that these differences are genre-specific. and that

intergroup patterns of different should not be generalized beyond the activities about which the SPPAs asked.

Use of the Media for Arts Consumption. More people encountered the arts about which the SPPA asked through the media than in live settings. The proportionate gap between white and minority attendance was smaller in consumption of the arts through the media than in live attendance. In other words. although members of all groups were more likely to watch the core-question arts than to attend them. this tendency was more pronounced in the case of minority-group members than in the case of whites.

People who watched an arts program on television were more likely than others to attend comparable live events. A tendency for arts viewing and attending to be more closely associated for Blacks and Hispanics than for whites. with smaller intergroup differences for viewers than for nonviewers. was evident in both 1982 and 1985 for Hispanic respondents with respect to classical music musical theatre. ballet and art. and for Black respondents with respect to opera and musical theatre.

Music Preferences. Respondents were asked if they enjoyed listening to each of thirteen musical genres: classical. opera. jazz. show tunes. big band. soul/rhythm and blues. rock. country western. easy listening. folk bluegrass. hymns/gospels. and barbershop. Their responses indicated notable differences associated with race or ethnicity within the context of a national musical culture

dominated by commercially produced genres. Black Americans were particularly likely to report enjoying forms like jazz. soul or blues. and gospel that have deep roots in the Black experience; whereas white and Hispanic respondents were more likely to choose country western. easy listening. and rock. But even commercial genres like rhythm and blues or country western that are associated historically with specific racial or ethnic communities appear to have permeated a national musical culture. Thus approximately one in four whites liked jazz and soul/blues. and an equal proportion of Blacks enjoyed country western music. Preferences were neither sharply segmented by race nor indicative of a mass culture in which racial and ethnic differences have atrophied.

Few respondents in any group reported enjoying opera. although substantial minorities liked classical music. jazz. and show tunes. Although whites were considerably more likely than Blacks to report enjoying classical music. Hispanics were almost as favorable in 1982 and more likely to report enjoying classical music than whites in 1985.

Parental socialization. White respondents were considerably more likely than either Black or Hispanic respondents to report that their parents took them to art museums or listened to classical music when they were children. Whites were only somewhat more likely than Blacks. who were more likely than Hispanics to report that their parents took them to plays. dance concerts. or

classical music concerts; or that their parents encouraged them to read when they were young.

Lessons and classes. Blacks and whites were almost equally likely to report having taken many kinds of classes in the arts during the high school years. whereas whites were more likely to report taking classes before and/or after high school. By contrast. Hispanic Americans were less likely than whites or Blacks to report taking many kinds of arts classes when they were young. with differences particularly marked with respect to music lessons or music appreciation courses.

Net Differences Between Blacks. Hispanics. and Whites

To what extent were differences in participation rates in the core activities the result of differences in the socio-economic standing and demographic characteristics of Blacks. Hispanics. and whites? Logistic regression analyses were used to predict participation in core activities. with attention to the effects of group membership (Black and Hispanic as compared to white). controlling for age. gender. educational attainment. occupation. family income. marital status. and SMSA residence. Even with these controls for sociodemographic factors. whites were significantly more likely than Blacks to participate in most of the core consumption activities. but not in attending jazz concerts (for which Blacks were significantly more likely to participate) or performing on a musical instrument or as actors. singers. or dancers. With respect to the former activities. a sub-

stantial portion but (with one exception) less than half of the gross difference in participation rates between Black and white Americans stemmed from sociodemographic especially socioeconomic. differences between the races. When one looks not at probabilities of participation in specific activities but at a measure of the range of performing-arts attendance activities (excluding jazz) in which respondents participated more of the gross difference between Blacks and whites is explained by sociodemographic factors.

Although these interracial differences are robust. they are small relative differences associated with other determinants of participation. With respect to all of the activities for which being Black significantly depresses participation (relative whites). the direct effect of race is dwarfed by the impact of educational attainment and (except for reading in 1982) exceeded by the effect of family income. Similarly. once other sociodemographic factors are taken into account. participation rates of Blacks and whites are more similar than are rates for men and women for all such activities but visiting art exhibitions.

Although gross rates of participation in the core activities were similar for Hispanic and Black respondents. larger proportions of the differences between Hispanics and whites than between Blacks and whites stemmed from intergroup differences in sociodemographic attributes. Controlling for socioeconomic and demographic factors left significant differences between whites and Hispanics in both years

only for reading and attendance at musical and dramatic theatrical performances -- the only ones of the ten core activities for which command of the English language is ordinarily essential.

Demand for More Participation

Some respondents in each year were shown a card listing the core arts attendance activities and told: "Few people can do everything they would like to do. But if you could do any of the things listed on this card as often as you wanted. which ones would you do more often than you have during the last 12 months?" Those respondents who said they would like to have attended a given kind of performance or exhibition more than they had in the past year were then asked to indicate which of several reasons caused them not to have participated more.

The percentage of respondents in each group who had not participated in each activity but who reported that they wanted to do so was added to the percentage who reported participating to estimate a "potential participation rate." i.e. the proportion who would have participated if everyone who said he or she wanted to had done so. These potential participation rates were much greater than actual participation rates for all groups. Except for white attendance (in 1982 and 1985) and Hispanic attendance (in 1985) at classical music concerts and white and Hispanic visits to art museums and galleries (in both years). potential rates were at

least twice the actual rates of attendance. and. in many cases. were much greater.

Demand for participation in the seven core consumption activities appeared to be cultivated by attendance. People who already attended were much more likely to want to attend more than were people who had not. Thus although there was much apparent unsated demand for these activities. most of it came from among attenders rather than nonattenders. Because. with the exception of jazz performances. whites were more likely to attend than were Blacks or Hispanics. unsated demand appeared to be greater among whites than among members of these groups. Moreover. nonattenders from groups that had the highest attendance rates (Blacks for jazz. whites for everything else) were more likely than nonattenders from other groups to want to attend. Consequently. if everyone had done what they said they wanted to do. the absolute margins in participation rates between whites and everyone else would have been wider. (For the exceptional activity. jazz. the gap between Blacks and others would have widened.) For most activities. however. the ratios of white to Black and Hispanic rates would have declined.

This could be interpreted as meaning that eliminating barriers to attendance would exacerbate intergroup differences in participation in the SPPA core activities (if one focusses on margins) or at best moderate only some differences and these only slightly (if one focusses on ratios). This

conclusion is questionable. however. on three grounds. First. the most important barriers to participation may be those that influence demand. not those that influence the ability of persons to satisfy demand they already have. Second. respondents to the SPPA "want-more" questions may have responded on the basis of taken-for-granted understandings about the costs associated with getting more of what they wanted. thus artificially suppressing demand among groups facing higher barriers. Third. it is possible that social-desirability bias may have inflated the "want-more" responses of whites more than those of other groups.

For members of all groups. cost and lack of time were the most important reasons given for nonparticipation. With respect to most activities. white respondents were more likely to give time as a reason than cost. and Hispanic respondents were more like to cite cost than time. In 1982, Black respondents were somewhat more likely to mention cost than time for most activities whereas in 1985 they were somewhat more likely to cite time than cost. Lack of availability was frequently cited by whites and a similar reason. that events were too far away. was often mentioned by Hispanics. Black respondents frequently mentioned these and also cited transportation problems as impediments to attendance more than whites and. for most activities. more than Hispanics. For most activities. Hispanics were more likely than Blacks or whites to cite child care problems as reasons for not attending. Fear of crime. handicap or

health problems poor quality. publicity. work related reasons. or performance time did not loom large as reasons for many respondents in any group.

Additional Findings from November/December 1982

Because all respondents to whom the SPPA was administered in November and December 1982 were asked all the questions. this subsample is useful for investigating a broader range of questions than could be addressed using data from the full 1982 or 1985 samples.

Net differences in home socialization and youthful lessons. Two scales were created. one a count of the number of kinds of home arts socialization each respondent reported receiving as a child. and one a count of the number of kinds of arts lessons or classes he or she had taken by age seventeen. Although Black and Hispanic respondents received fewer home artistic socialization experiences as children and took fewer arts-related classes or lessons in their youth than whites. these differences were entirely a result of the fact that Black and Hispanic respondents had parents who had received fewer years of formal education than did the parents of white respondents. Controlling for parental education. Black and Hispanic parents gave their children slightly. but significantly. more kinds of home socialization experiences than did comparable white parents. and no differences remained in the number of kinds of youthful lessons.

Taste for art music and related genres. Factor analysis isolated a cluster of musical genres including classical and chamber music. opera. show tunes. big band. and easy listening music. which were summed into an additive scale. White respondents scored significantly higher than Blacks and Hispanics on this scale. Controls for sociodemographic factors reduced the sizable Black/white difference by almost half. but a modest significant difference remained. Sociodemographic controls eliminated all of the difference between Hispanics and whites.

Television art program viewing. A scale was created as a simple count of the number of kinds of art programs that each respondent reported having watched on television. White respondents reported viewing slightly but significantly more kinds of televised arts programs than Blacks or Hispanics. but these small differences were entirely the result of sociodemographic differences between whites and the other groups.

Participation scales: Factor analysis of combined responses to the SPPA's core and other participation questions generated five scales consisting of participation items reflecting. respectively: performing-arts attendance (including and excluding jazz); visual and literary consumption activities; performing-art production activities; and visual and literary production activities. Regression analysis was used to examine the effects of race and ethnicity on these scales. controlling for sociodemographic characteristics,

socialization and lessons. and artistic taste and interest as reflected by the art-music and television-viewing scales. The results added further evidence that one cannot generalize about the effects of race or ethnicity on cultural participation per se. Hispanic Americans attend fewer public arts consumption activities than whites (both performing and visually oriented). but this difference was almost entirely the result of the fact that white Americans had more years of education. higher incomes. and higher status occupations. Hispanic respondents participated in no fewer art-producing activities (either performing or plastic) than white respondents. and. with both sociodemographic factors and socialization/lessons controlled. they participated in these art-producing activities significantly more than did comparable whites.

There is no statistically significant difference between Black and white respondents with respect to participating on-stage or backstage in performing-arts events. but Blacks scored significantly lower than whites on the other scales. Sociodemographic differences, however, accounted for approximately 80 percent of the significant difference between Black and white Americans in the number of kinds of performing-arts events attended with jazz excluded. and all of the difference with jazz included. The remaining gaps were not statistically significant.

Controlling for sociodemographic differences eliminated approximately 40 percent of the differences between white

and Black respondents in the visual/literary consumption and production scales, but statistically significant, albeit small, differences remained. The remaining significant difference in production was attributable to differences between Blacks and whites in youthful artistic socialization (both at home and through lessons and classes); whereas the differences in consumption remained significant even after including the full range of controls.

Separate predictive models for Blacks, Hispanics, and whites. Data on each group were separated in order to see if the factors predicting outcome measures were similar or different for the three groups. For the most part, artistic socialization, taste, and participation measures were predicted by the same variables for Blacks and Hispanics as for whites. Two exceptions were notable, however.

First, the effects of age on parental socialization, musical taste for art music and related genres, and arts television watching were greater for whites than for Blacks. With parental education controlled, white parents of young respondents offered fewer arts socialization experiences than comparably educated white parents of older respondents, whereas Black parents of younger respondents offered more than comparable Black parents of older respondents, suggesting that a convergence is occurring. Similarly, controlling for other sociodemographic factors, tastes for art music and TV art program viewing increased with age for whites, but not for Blacks and Hispanics. (These differences were sig-

nificant except for white/Hispanic TV arts program viewing.) Although these results might mean that white Americans' tastes change more with aging than those of Black or Hispanic Americans. they may also indicate a convergence of all groups over time with respect to tastes for art music and convergence between Black and white Americans in watching arts programs on television. These findings are consistent with inspection of means by race and age: intergroup differences in socialization and lessons. taste for art music. and arts television watching were smaller among younger respondents than for older respondents.

Second. education had a significantly stronger effect on arts television viewing and on all of the participation scales except for performance production activities for whites than for Blacks. although in most cases education was a significantly positive predictor for both groups. Moreover, the effects on the participation scales of taking lessons or classes in the arts were weaker for Blacks than for other groups. although these differences were not statistically significant. Watching arts television programs was also less strongly predictive of attendance for Blacks. and the differences between Blacks and Hispanics were significant with respect to nonperformance consumption and production activities. In other words. the analyses provided tentative evidence that formal education. both general and arts-specific was more weakly related to interest and participation in the arts for Blacks than for other groups.

Change over time. For most participation activities, gaps between white and minority subpopulations were greater for older than for younger respondents. Most of the decline in intergroup differences appeared to be largely the result of changes in the sociodemographic profiles of Black, Hispanic, and white Americans, especially rapid increases in the educational attainment of the two former groups, rather than of changes in the effects of race on the participation of otherwise similar men and women.

Chapter 1: Race, Ethnicity and Participation in the Arts

Since the creation of the United States' first modern museums and orchestras in the period after the Civil War, many Americans have regarded the arts as a public good, beneficial to citizens who participate in them. The founders of this country's arts organizations proclaimed their desire to awaken their countrymen to the rewards of participation in the arts. During the first half of the twentieth century, many commentators complained that the arts, in their view, played only a small role in the life of most Americans./1

During the Great Depression, a number of institutions, including the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Works Progress Administration of the federal government, supported the extension of the visual arts and "good" music to communities that had little access to them./2 The impetus of such activities, however, was towards expanding access to the arts for the public, generally defined, rather than redistributing access to groups that had too little of it./3 Af-

---

1/ See, e.g., Richard Bach, The Place of the Arts in American Life (New York: The Carnegie Corporation, 1924); and Frederick P. Keppel and Robert L. Duffus, The Arts in American Life (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933); Melvin E. Haggerty, Art as a Way of Life (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935).

2/ Brenda Jubin, Program in the Arts: 1911-1967 (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1968); Richard D. McKinzie, The New Deal for Artists (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973); Jane DeHart Mathews, The Federal Theatre: 1935-1939 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967).

3/ For an example of the preoccupation with numbers in this period, see Paul Marshall Rea, The Museum and the Community:

ter the second world war, especially from the 1960s on, attention turned specifically to making the arts available to groups believed to have been culturally isolated.

Concerns about cultural participation did not lack precedent, of course. Jane Addams, the progressive founder of Chicago's Hull House, wrote just after the century's turn of the "pathetic evidence that the older immigrants do not expect the solace of art in this country."/4 But it has been with the emergence of government and the large foundations as patrons of the arts that attention to minority participation has become widespread. The shift of concern from the gross amount of artistic activity in the United States to the distribution of opportunity to participate in such activity stemmed from at least three separate factors.

First, the 1960s witnessed increased attention to the problems of the least well off Americans and to the equitable distribution of such public goods as educational opportunity. The Civil Rights Movement, which stimulated this concern, focussed attention particularly upon the position of racial and ethnic minorities. Second, the traditionally dominant role of individual patrons in financing the arts was complemented by support from large institutions, especially private foundations and federal and state government agencies, which were compelled, by their charter purposes,

A Study of Social Laws and Consequences (Lancaster, Pa.: Science Press, 1932).

4/ Jane Addams, Twenty Years at Hull-House with Autobiographical Notes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), p. 352.

to take a broad view of the public good. Third, with the national expansion in the number and activity of arts organizations in the 1970s, inequality in access to the arts came to be perceived less as a matter of regional disparity (at least among metropolitan areas) than of differences among groups within regions. As part of this concern, the Congress of the United States recently encouraged the National Endowment for the Arts to report on the underrepresentation of minorities and other groups in the arts and on what that agency and its state counterparts are doing about it.

It is the purpose of this report to examine the participation of racial and ethnic minorities in certain arts activities, primarily as audience members and to a lesser degree as amateur producers of art. (We shall have nothing to say about participation in professional artistic practice or in the governance of cultural organizations.) In the remainder of this chapter, we describe the data we have analyzed and the definitions we have employed in analyzing it.

Data: The 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts

Attempts to describe the participation of racial and ethnic minorities in audiences for the arts have been hampered to date by the inadequacy of the available information. A review of the evidence published in 1978 reported that studies of attendance at specific museums and performing-arts institutions showed Black and Hispanic persons present in proportions substantially less than their shares of the relevant

metropolitan populations./5 But the studies upon which these conclusions were based were few and of dubious technical quality. When researchers surveyed samples of metropolitan, state, or national populations, differences between white, Black, and (in the few cases where they were treated separately) Hispanic respondents were relatively modest. Moreover, even in these studies, results varied substantially, and questions about survey methodology led the authors to regard the findings as inconclusive./6

Nor have more recent studies resolved the matter. One study of a national sample found Blacks and Hispanics present among arts attenders in numbers comparable to their share of the population./7 Another analysis of a national sample reported that Blacks were represented proportionately among "arts actives," but very highly present among those who attended arts events but espoused anti-arts attitudes and overrepresented, as well, among the culturally inactive./8 An analysis of these same data using statistical

---

5/ Paul DiMaggio, Michael Useem and Paula Brown, Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums: A Critical Review. Research Division Report #9, (Washington, National Endowment for the Arts, 1978), pp. 29-33.

6/ Ibid.

7/ E.g., Marshall G. Greenberg and Ronald E. Frank, "Leisure Lifestyles: Segmentation of Interests, Needs, Demographics, and Television Viewing," pp. 439-58 in Richard A. Peterson, ed., Patterns of Cultural Choice, special issue of American Behavioral Scientist 26, 4 (1983).

8/ Michael Hughes and Richard A. Peterson, "Isolating Cultural Choice Patterns," pp. 459-78 in Peterson, ed., ibid.

controls and different definitions of participation, reported that Blacks were no less likely than comparable whites to attend performing-arts events or museums, to listen to most kinds of music, or to participate in amateur art-making activities. They were, however, significantly less likely than white respondents to listen to country music and more likely than whites to listen to religious music./9 A study by two of the same researchers, but using a different data set restricted to the southern U.S., also using statistical controls, found Blacks participating at lower levels than whites in active visual-arts production activities, but at the same rate as comparable whites in performing-arts attendance./10 A study of St. Louis residents reported that Blacks were much less likely than whites to visit art museums or exhibits, somewhat less likely to participate in crafts activities, and only slightly less likely to attend performing-arts events./11 Yet another study, this one in Syracuse, found Black/white differences in arts attendance

---

9/ Peter Marsden, John Shelton Reed, M.D. Kennedy and K.M. Stinson, "American Regional Cultures and Differences in Leisure Time Activities," Social Forces 60 (1982): 1023-49.

10/ Peter Marsden and John Shelton Reed, "Cultural Choice Among Southerners: Seven Patterns," pp. 479-92 in Peterson, ed., ibid.

11/ Betty Crowther and Alfred Kahn, "Arts and Leisure Activities in the St. Louis Region," pp. 509-20 in Peterson, ed., ibid.

among middle-class but not among lower-class respondents, but the differences were not statistically significant./12

Although such findings are intriguing, few studies were designed with an investigation of racial or ethnic patterns in mind. The samples are diverse in location, method of questioning and response rate. Few use statistical controls. And to operationalize participation they rely exclusively on scales that bear similar names but comprise greatly varying measures.

With the completion of the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPAs), more reliable data became available for the first time. The SPPA surveys were undertaken by the U.S. Bureau of the Census as part of the National Crime Survey at the request of the National Endowment for the Arts. Responses from 17,254 persons in 1982 and 13,675 in 1985 were weighted (by age, gender, and race) to be representative of all non-institutionalized Americans 18 years of age or older. The advantages of the SPPA data over data from earlier surveys include national scope and representativeness, careful question design and pre-testing, closely supervised survey administration (usually in person rather than over the telephone), the broad scope of the questions asked, and the large number of respondents. Consequently, the SPPAs permit researchers and policy makers to pose more interesting questions and to gen-

---

12/ Sturgeon M. Stamps and Miriam B. Stamps, "Race, Class and Leisure Activities of Urban Residents," Journal of Leisure Research 17, 1 (1985), pp. 40-56.

eralize more confidently than we have been able to heretofore./13

The SPPA included eight kinds of questions about cultural participation, broadly defined. The first set of questions (core activities) asked respondents to report on whether or not they had engaged in each of ten kinds of activity during the previous year and, if so, how often they had done so during the previous month./14 The second set of questions (barriers) asked respondents which of the core activities they would like to participate in more than they do now, and what factors prevent them from doing so. The third set of questions (socialization) asked respondents about the extent to which their parents encouraged certain kinds of participation in the arts and whether (and if so, when) they had taken several kinds of classes or lessons in the arts. The fourth set (not analyzed in this report) asked respondents about their participation in a range of non-arts activities. The fifth set (location) asked respondents who res-

---

13/ A detailed technical description of the procedures for the 1982 SPPA (which were similar to those for the 1985 survey) is available in John P. Robinson, Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, and Timothy A. Triplett, Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey, October 1985 report to the Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts. Background information on the 1985 survey is available in Timothy A. Triplett and Jeffrey M. Holland, Public Participation in the Arts: The 1982 and 1985 User's Manual (draft, October 1985), report to the Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts.

14/ The text of the survey is available from the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division. Because only tiny percentages engaged in any given activity more than once in the month preceding the survey, only data on participation during the previous year are analyzed in this report.

ponded affirmatively to one or more of the core questions where their participation had taken place. The sixth set of questions (music preference) asked respondents whether or not they liked each of several genres of music, and which they liked best. The seventh (other participation) asked whether or not respondents had participated in several cultural activities that were not included among the core questions. The last set (media) asked respondents whether they had watched or listened to several kinds of arts presentations on television, radio, records or tapes. All respondents in both years were asked the core questions, whereas only a portion (approximately one third in 1982 and one sixth in 1985) were asked the others./15

Defining our Terms

The task of this report -- to explore the extent to which members of racial and ethnic minority groups are underrepresented as participants in the arts -- is less straightforward than it may appear. To accomplish our goal, we must define our terms. What is a racial or ethnic minority group? What do we mean by "underrepresentation"? What do we mean by "participation in the arts"?

15/ The survey was administered each month for 12 months in 1982, and 6 months in 1985, with all but the core questions rotated from month to month. (All questions were asked in the final two months of 1982.) Consequently, analyses of responses to all but the core questions are based on only a portion of the total number of respondents. Because responses were weighted to be representative of the non-institutionalize population over 18 for each month, as well as for each of the two years, findings are equally generalizable.

These questions are far from academic, for different definitions of the terms entail different definitions of the problem and, in some cases, different implicit values as to what states of affairs are desirable. Different definitions may also yield different conclusions. In the sections that follow, we explain how and why we define our terms as we do, and speculate about the possible consequences of our choices. Because these explanations provide warnings that may help the reader interpret our results, we urge that he or she read them carefully.

Racial or ethnic minorities. Although race and ethnicity have biological and ancestral correlates, social scientists view these categories as socially constructed./16 What this means is that the extent to and ways in which differences associated with racial or national origin are perceived as important bases for social cohesion, exclusion and individual identity vary considerably among societies and across historical eras.

In the United States, race is treated as a social fact, and most respondents to surveys have little trouble designating themselves as Black (or Negro or Afro-American), white, Asian (or Pacific Islander), or American Indian (or

---

16/ William L. Yancey, Eugene P. Ericksen, and Richard Juliani, "Emergent ethnicity: A review and reformulation," American Sociological Review 41 (1976): 391-403; Susan Olzak, "Contemporary ethnic mobilization," Annual Review of Sociology 9 (1983): 355-74.

Native American)./17 These distinctions are reflected in relatively low rates of intermarriage among members of different racial groups, so defined. Because the SPPA sample was designed to be nationally representative as to race, we began with the racial categories available to us in that survey: in 1982, White, Black, and Other; and, in 1985, White, Black, Asian and Other./18

With respect to ethnicity, the situation is more complicated. Many Americans are of mixed national origin. If asked to designate their ethnicity, they may have difficulty doing so; and if compelled to do so, their responses may only partially accurate. Moreover, only a few of the most common ethnic identifications are coded in the SPPA data. Categories with fewer respondents are aggregated into an "Other" code. To complicate matters further, because the SPPA was not designed to be representative with respect to

---

17/ 95 percent of respondents to the 1982 SPPA who reported their race as Black reported their ethnicity as Afro-American or Negro. In 1985, the figure was 92 percent. Each year, most other Black respondents reported their ethnicity as "other," a category that would have included such Caribbean ethnicities as Jamaican or Haitian. In each year more than 99 percent of respondents who reported their ethnicity as Afro-American or Negro reported their race as Black.

18/ The "Other" category in 1982 consists of Asian Americans, American Indians, and persons who failed to choose one of several races from a set presented by the interviewer. In 1985, it excluded Asian Americans and included only a very small number of respondents. We do not report results for the "Other" category. Because of its heterogeneity and because we do not have data on its composition, such results could not be interpreted. Unfortunately, then, the data do not permit us to describe the artistic participation of Native Americans.

ethnicity (as distinct from race), we do not know if respondents are typical of their national-origin groups.

To assess the severity of these problems, we compared the national-origin responses in the SPPA (for both years) to those of the 1980 Decennial Census (Table 1-1). Each SPPA respondent was asked to select his or her "origin" or "descent" from a pre-determined list. By contrast, the Census of Population asked people to indicate their national ancestral origins, permitting coding multiple responses for persons of mixed national descent.

Several consequences follow from this difference in survey technique. More than 80 percent of census respondents reported useable information on one or more national origins./19 By contrast, SPPA respondents were often confused by this question and the responses of 55 percent fell into an "Other" category. (Some of the "Others" belonged to ethnic groups not separately coded; but many simply failed to provide an appropriate response.)/20

19/ In the 1980 Census of Population, 83 percent reported at least one ancestry group, 6 percent said they were "American," 1 percent gave a religious or otherwise unclassifiable response, and 10 percent did not respond to the question at all. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980.

20/ In the 1982 SPPA, 95 percent of the respondents whose ethnicity was coded "other" reported their race as White, 4 percent fell in the "Other" race category, and under 1 percent said they were Black. In the 1985 SPPA, 96 percent of "other" ethnics reported their race as White, 3 percent as Asian, and a scattering as Black, American Indian, or Other. We are grateful to Carmen DeNavas, Helen Montagliani, and Robert Tinari of the Bureau of the Census for explaining the manner in which the Bureau asked about race and ethnicity in its interviews.

Table 1-1: Comparison of National Origin Estimates from 1980 Census and 1982 and 1985 SPPAs

ORIGIN	SPPA82	SPPA85	Census	Single	Multiple
German	8.9	8.0	26.1	36.5	63.5
Italian	3.7	3.8	6.5	56.5	43.5
Irish	5.0	4.6	21.3	25.7	74.3
French	1.6	1.9	6.9	23.8	76.2
Polish	1.9	1.8	4.5	46.3	53.7
Russian	1.0	0.8	1.5	49.6	50.4
English	5.5	5.4	26.3	47.9	52.1
Scottish	0.9	0.9	5.3	11.7	88.3
Welsh	0.3	0.2	0.9	18.5	81.5
Mexican	3.5	4.4	4.1	90.9	9.1
Puerto Rican	0.7	0.6	0.8	88.0	12.0
Cuban	0.4	0.2	0.3	83.7	16.3
Central/South American	0.5	0.8	NA	NA	NA
Other Spanish	0.6	0.6	NA	NA	NA
Afro-American	10.3	10.3	11.13	97.9	2.1
Other	55.3	55.7	NA	NA	NA

Note: Rightmost two columns report percentage of respondents to 1980 Census in each national-origin group who reported single and multiple national origins, respectively. Only those national origins coded in SPPA are included. Because respondents to the 1980 Census could give multiple responses, the Census columns sum to more than 100 percent. All percentages from SPPA are weighted by race, age, and gender, and missing data (1.95 percent for 1982, 2.55 percent for 1985) are omitted from base. Source for Census data is Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980, Supplementary Report PC80-S1-10, April, 1983 (Table 2).

Table 1-2: Comparison of Estimates for Race and Hispanic Origin Between 1982 and 1985 SPPAs and 1980 Census

	SPPA82	SPPA85	1980 Census
White	87.1	87.2	85.0
Black	10.6	10.8	10.5
American Indian	NA	0.2	0.5
Asian	NA	1.6	1.5
Other	2.3	0.1	2.5
Hispanic Origin	5.6	6.7	5.5

Note: Individuals 18 and over only. SPPA figures based on data weighted for race, age, and gender. Census figures from Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, General Population Characteristics: U.S. Summary, PC80-1-B1 (tables 43 and 44). Census figures for "Other" calculated by subtracting sum of other racial categories from 100 percent.

Because Census respondents were permitted to name more than one ethnic origin, Census percentages for ethnicities tended to be higher than those in the SPPA, especially where most members of an ethnic group reported multiple national origins. For example, more than one in four respondents to the 1980 Census claimed German descent, and a similar proportion reported having English blood. By contrast, just 8.9 percent and 5.5 percent of respondents to the 1982 SPPA reported their single ethnic identification as German or English, respectively.

On the basis of these data and our discussions with staff of the Bureau of the Census, we regretfully concluded that, for the most part, the SPPA ethnicity data were not suitable for further analysis. First, the number of mixed-origin respondents revealed by the 1980 Census suggests that for many Americans requests to report a single ethnic origin elicit misleading responses. Second, the fact that more than half of the SPPA respondents were coded as "other" meant that fewer than half the responses could be analyzed to compare the artistic participation of members of different ethnic groups. Third, the disparity between Census and SPPA results for those ethnic groups that reported the highest proportion of mixed origins suggested that the ethnic breakdowns in the SPPA were themselves not representative of the American population. Fourth, the number of respondents in many of the ethnic categories was too small to analyze. Finally, reports by Census staff who had observed many in-

terviews indicated that respondents often had difficulty understanding the ethnicity question in the SPPA.

We did find the SPPA ethnic origin data useful for one group of respondents: those whose ethnicity was coded Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish. The proportions of respondents who reported their ethnic origin as Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban were comparable to those reported in the Census, and relatively few Census respondents in any of these groups reported multiple ethnic origins. Given these findings, and given the fact that Hispanic Americans comprise an important set of ethnic minority groups, we felt warranted in distinguishing between Americans of Hispanic descent and other Americans in our analyses./21

Almost all Hispanic respondents to the 1982 and 1985 SPPA (99 and 97 percent, respectively) reported their race as White, and the absolute numbers of those who did not were

---

21/ Our aggregation of ethnic categories into a broader Hispanic group yields a category consistent with the federal government's definition of Hispanic as "A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race" (OMB Directive Number 15, as revised May 12, 1977).

far too small to permit separate analysis./22 Therefore, we did not divide the Hispanic respondents by race.

A more difficult decision concerned whether or not to divide the Hispanic group by national origin. The Hispanic category includes members of ethnic groups that are quite different from one another in many respects. In 1985, for example, the median age of Cuban-Americans was 39, compared with 23 for Mexican-Americans and 24 for Americans of Puerto Rican origin. The latter group is the least well off economically, with 42 percent below the poverty line, compared to 24 percent of Mexican-Americans and just 13 percent of Cuban-Americans./23

Despite this internal diversity, we decided for most purposes to treat Americans of Hispanic descent in the aggregate, for several reasons./24 First, for many purposes

---

22/ By contrast, in the 1980 Census (the report cited in the note at the bottom of Table 1-2), 41 percent of Hispanic respondents reported their race as something other than Black or White. The difference is a result of different question phrasing: SPPA respondents were asked to designate their race and given a brief set of options that did not include "other." Census respondents, by contrast, were asked to choose from among a longer list that included both racial and ethnic categories.

23/ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1985 (Advance Report), December 1985, Series P-20, No. 403 (Table 2 and Figure 3).

24/ For insightful criticism of the "Hispanic" category, see David E. Hayes Bautista and Jorge Chapa, "Latino terminology: Conceptual bases for standardized terminology," American Journal of Public Health 77 (1987): 61-68; for a pragmatic defense, see Fernando M. Trevino, "Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations," pp. 69-72 in the same issue.

there were too few respondents in the ethnic groups other than Mexican-Americans to justify separate analyses./25 Second, our treatment of the Hispanic-origin ethnic category conforms to standard practice in most social-science reports. Third, although the Hispanic-origin ethnic group is internally diverse, so are the racial categories (white and Black) used in our analyses: decisions about categories invariably require a tradeoff between sensitivity to group differences and economy of presentation. In recognition of such differences, however, we did undertake separate analyses by Hispanic-origin subgroup of rates of participation in the core activities about which the SPPA asked. These are reported in Chapter 2.

On the basis of these decisions, we concentrate in this report on comparing the responses to the SPPAs of four groups, three racial and one ethnic: White Americans (not of Hispanic descent); Black Americans (not of Hispanic descent); Asian Americans (not of Hispanic descent); and Hispanic Americans. (Data permitting the separation of responses

---

25/ The 1985 SPPA Hispanic-American respondents were typical of their ethnic groups with respect to educational attainment: Median years of educational attainment (for respondents 25 years or over) for Mexican-Americans was 10 in the SPPA, 10.2 in the 1985 current population survey (CPS); for Puerto Ricans the SPPA median was 11, CPS 11.2; for Cubans, the CPS and SPPA medians were both 12. (SPPA data, and thus SPPA medians, were expressed as whole numbers.) Nonetheless, in the absence of sampling, given the low numbers we regard comparisons among Hispanic ethnic groups as potentially misleading. Census data are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1985 (Advance Report), December 1985, Series P-20, No. 403, p.4.

from Asian Americans were available for 1985 only.) Although the SPPA surveys were designed and weighted to be representative of the racial composition of the American population, no such representativeness is guaranteed for the Hispanic ethnic category. As Table 1-1 indicates, the percentages of Hispanic Americans in the SPPA samples are close to but not identical to the proportion of these groups in American population./26

This approach to dividing up the American population is consistent both with current convention and with the limitations of our data. Nonetheless, the reader should be aware that there is much variation in behavior within the groups we compare -- far more, indeed, than there is between them. If subsequent surveys interview enough respondents to permit division of samples on the basis of finer ethnic categories, researchers will no doubt discover differences in participation that are obscured by our scheme of categorization, constrained as it is by the number of respondents to the SPPAs.

Underrepresentation. The term "underrepresentation" is pejorative, indicating a state of affairs that is unjust. Because the term is value laden and because it has several meanings, we shall avoid it in the narrative of this report. Nonetheless, because a concern with "underrepresentation"

26/ Part of the large increase in the 1985 reflects the fact that the Hispanic population increased 16 percent between 1980 and 1985 as compared with a 3.3 percent increase in the population overall. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1985 (Advance Report), December 1985, Series P-20, No. 403, p.1.

underlies the analyses we undertake, it is necessary to discuss the issue at some length.

The Oxford English Dictionary does not define "underrepresentation," but it does define "representation" in eight ways, of which the most relevant to our purposes is "the fact of standing for, or in place of, some other thing or person, especially with a right or authority to act on their account."/27 The usage comes from the realm of politics, in which groups (or communities) are represented in legislative or administrative bodies. The use of the term with respect to artistic participation implies that participation is a valued right, and that underrepresentation of a group indicates that the group has been excluded from participation.

In one sense, members of a racial or ethnic group can be described as underrepresented relative to some other group if they participate less frequently. We can assess the degree of underrepresentation, thus defined, by comparing the rate of participation by different groups. If 24 percent of Group A reports attending arts and crafts fairs, for example, but just 12 percent of Group B, the members of Group B are underrepresented as participants in this activity. We investigate underrepresentation by race and ethnicity in this sense in chapter 2. If one is concerned with equality of result -- i.e., if one feels that equalizing par-

---

27/ The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 2499.

ticipation in the arts by members of different racial or ethnic groups is itself a legitimate goal of public policy -- then such differences among groups are a concern in their own right.

By contrast, public policy in the United States has often been concerned not with equality of result but with equality of opportunity. From the perspective of equality of opportunity, it is less important that members of different groups all participate to the same degree than that persons are not disadvantaged, by virtue of their racial or ethnic origin, in attempting to share a public good. American society tolerates all sorts of inequality, so this argument goes, opposing as odious only inequality that results directly from statuses like race or gender into which one is born. Thus what are important are not differences in rates of participation by members of different groups, but rather differences in opportunities to participate that are a consequence of, rather than simply associated with, membership in a racial or ethnic minority group.

In this view, the appropriate measure of underrepresentation is the existence of a negative effect of racial or ethnic group membership on rates of artistic participation, net the influence of people's other characteristics. To return to our previous example, imagine that members of Group A attend arts and crafts fairs less than members of Group B not because they are excluded on the basis of race but because they have less of other characteristics (e.g.,

education or money) that are associated with participation. If we control for these other characteristics, we can estimate the net effect of racial or ethnic origin. This we do, using logistic regression analysis, in chapter 3.

There is another reason one might wish to look at the "net effect" of race or ethnicity on artistic participation rather than the simple association of the two. Measures of association, like those in the tables presented in chapter 2, tell us what degree of inequality exists, but they do not tell us why it exists. Inspecting the factors that account for such variation in participation, as we do in chapter 3, enables us to assess what would have to change in order to reduce the inequality we see. For example, if differences in the artistic participation of different racial or ethnic groups were simply a result of differences in the length of time members of different groups stay in school, then equalizing educational opportunity would suffice to equalize artistic participation. If not, then other programs would be required.

The factors that lead to participation in the arts may not be the same for all groups. If one is concerned with increasing racial or ethnic minority participation, then it is important to understand the factors that account for participation by members of these groups, and how these factors may differ from those predicting participation by members of the majority. In chapter 3, we present results of separate analyses for white, Black and Hispanic respondents

to the SPPAs, to explore the possibility that participation in the arts stems from different origins in each.

The notion of "underrepresentation" implies that participation in the arts is a public good that, like education or political influence, almost anyone would find attractive. By contrast, most of us think of our artistic participation (or lack thereof) in individualistic, voluntaristic terms. Differences in artistic participation, either gross or net, may result from the exclusion of some groups from artistic opportunities (either through active discrimination, of the kind commonly exercised against Black Americans in the past, or through more subtle, perhaps unintended, social pressures that make members of minority groups feel unwelcome or uncomfortable at artistic events). Or they may simply reflect intergroup differences in taste or preferences. The SPPA data do not provide such clear accounts of the extent to which racial or ethnic differences in participation represent exclusion or differences in taste as they do of the extent to which such differences exist. But they do permit us to hazard some guesses, which we shall do in chapter 4. Note, however, that many arts advocates may not regard such evidence as relevant to public policy. In their view, participation in the arts is a good thing, and people who do not want more of it may simply have been deprived of opportunities that would have awakened them to its virtues.

Finally, to the extent that underrepresentation (however defined) is a concern, it is important to know what sub-

groups are most underrepresented and whether underrepresentation is increasing or decreasing. In chapter 5, we shall present the results of analyses comparing the extent of racial and ethnic differences in artistic participation among men and women and among Americans of different ages and educational levels. In that chapter, we shall also use a special subsample of the 1982 SPPA that enables us to explore the impact of childhood socialization and indices of musical taste and artistic interest on several kinds of participation, controlling for socioeconomic factors.

In conclusion, "underrepresentation" may mean at least three different things: 1) differences in the extent to which members of different groups participate; 2) differences in the extent of participation of members of some groups compared with members of other groups who are in other respects similar to them; or 3) differences in the extent of participation by members of different groups attributable to differences in access rather than to differences in taste. Each definition entails a different view of art and of the nature of a just society, and assessing underrepresentation according to each definition requires a different methodological approach. Rather than choose one, we address each definition, investigating the first two rather thoroughly and the third as well as limited data permit.

Artistic participation. No two people define "art" in the same way. Some would restrict the term to the most prestigious expressions of "high culture," like ballet,

sculpture, or opera. Others would broaden this definition to include more modern forms, such as jazz and film. For others, the definition of art embraces the "folk arts" and "crafts," from tarantellas and Irish jigs to Native American metal work and Balkan folk songs. Still others would include the full range of "the popular arts," from the Rockettes to "Wheel of Fortune."

People also differ in their definition of participation, or at least in their estimation of the kinds of participation that are most important. For some, a healthy society is one in which most people expose themselves to what they define as good art in whatever way possible: live, on screen, or by sound recording. Others believe that we must encounter the arts in person if we are to benefit from them. Still others deride the society of spectators, maintaining that the measure of a nation's cultural well-being is the extent to which people create and perform themselves, rather than enjoying the results of the activity of others.

We call attention to such definitional issues because we believe it likely that the extent to which we find large differences in participation among racial and ethnic groups may depend on where we look: that is, it will depend upon the kinds of art forms and the kinds of participation that we investigate. Consequently, the findings of a report such as this one are likely to depend, at least in part, upon the measures of participation that are available.

Fortunately the 1982 and 1985 SPPAs took a relatively inclusive view both of the arts and of participation. The core questions, for example, asked respondents about jazz, as well as classical music and opera; and asked respondents whether they played a musical instrument (in any kind of musical presentation) or acted, sang, or danced on stage, and not just whether they watched others do so. Respondents were asked whether they had taken classes in photography as well as in painting; and in craft arts as well as fine arts and art or music appreciation. And one question asked respondents whether they enjoyed each of a wide range of musical genres, from country-western to chamber music. Moreover, people were asked about the arts they watched on television or listened to on radio or sound recording, as well as those they witnessed live.

Nonetheless, the designers of any survey are limited in the number of questions they can ask and must exercise selectivity in their choice of topics. The SPPA questions tend to reflect both its sponsorship by the National Endowment for the Arts, and what is probably a loose consensus among educated Americans as to what forms of artistic participation matter most. Thus the Survey focussed predominantly, although not exclusively, upon the arts that are within the domain of the Arts Endowment; upon the kinds of performances or presentations that are sponsored by nonprofit cultural organizations or public television stations rather than those that are produced by commercial media conglomerates;

and upon the kinds of performance activities that are more likely to take place on a public stage than in one's living room or on the street.

Notwithstanding the legitimacy of these emphases, the choice of activities and the way in which questions are worded may have influenced the patterns that emerged from the data. For one thing, the SPPA simply did not ask specifically about certain activities: e.g., break dancing, graffiti art, clog dancing, rap music, many kinds of ethnic dance and song, or televised crime dramas. It did not ask people if they listened to a choir in church (although one question was worded to include people who sang in one) or if their parents took them to crafts exhibits at country fairs. Consequently, we cannot know if racial and ethnic patterns of participation in these activities are different from patterns in the activities about which respondents were asked. It follows that the data cannot yield grand generalizations about racial and ethnic differences in "artistic participation," in the broadest definition of that term. To the extent the SPPA focusses upon activities that are favored by white college graduates, it may overestimate the extent of the difference between the artistic participation of white Americans and that of everyone else.

On the other hand, constraints of space and expense required that certain questions be phrased in a inclusive manner. For example, one core question asked respondents if they had gone to a live performance of a non-musical stage

play (not including elementary- or secondary-school productions). Another asked if respondents had read novels, short stories, poetry or plays. A question in the socialization section asked respondents if they had taken music lessons. The absence of racial or ethnic differences in responses to these questions (were we to find them) would not permit us to infer that the artistic practices of white, Black, Asian, and Hispanic Americans were the same. For it is possible that members of these groups attend different plays, read different novels, and take lessons on different musical instruments. Given the available data, we have no way of knowing.

In other words, even though the 1982 and 1985 SPPAs contain an unusually inclusive set of questions, we must be careful to recognize that the artistic activities about which respondents were asked are likely to influence the extent and nature of the racial and ethnic differences that we find. We shall explore these differences, in a rough sort of way, by using the variation that is present in the questions to ask if the size of differences by race and ethnicity seems to depend upon whether questions refer to a broad range of artistic pursuits or to more narrowly defined "high-culture" activities; to consumption through the media, to live attendance, or to the performing or making of art. We shall compound the difficulties, however, by focussing most of our attention in chapters 3 and 4 on responses to the core and related questions. Given limited time and re-

sources, we chose to emphasize these for reasons both substantive (because they are most policy relevant) and pragmatic (because they were asked to all the respondents, and consequently are amenable to fine-grained analysis). This emphasis makes it especially important to remember that our findings pertain to a circumscribed, albeit important and relatively broad, set of issues.

Chapter 2: Rates of Participation by Race and Ethnicity

The purpose of this chapter is to report and compare the rates at which members of three racial and one ethnic group participate in several artistic activities. In addition, we shall compare responses to questions about different kinds of artistic activities to see if the pattern of inter-group differences -- where they are highest and where they are lowest -- can give us hints as to the sources of racial and ethnic variation. The comparisons made below allow us to document differences in participation, but not to explain them. Differences may result from patterns of racial or ethnic exclusion, from differences in taste that are associated with race or ethnicity, or from other factors (for example, educational attainment or occupational status) that are associated with both race and participation in the arts.

The Core Activities

We begin by looking at responses to questions about participation in ten core activities about which respondents were asked each month in which the surveys were administered. Responses to these questions, weighted by age, race, and gender, appear in Table 2-1./1

Respondents were asked whether they had participated in each activity during the previous year, and how many times they had participated during the previous month. Because

1/ The text of the full questionnaire is available from the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division.

Table 2-1: Participation in Core Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Attend jazz concert		Attend classical conc.		Attend opera performance		Attend musical		Attend play	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	9.13	9.48	14.42	14.31	3.33	2.97	20.67	18.60	13.44	13.10
	13890	10861	13909	10875	13901	10861	13908	10873	13899	10869
BLACK	15.64	13.08	6.67	6.39	1.36	1.43	10.10	8.45	5.82	6.09
	1654	1384	1656	1384	1654	1384	1656	1384	1655	1383
HISPANIC	8.27	6.55	7.87	6.77	2.52	0.78	10.96	9.52	5.47	6.41
	940	788	941	789	940	788	940	789	941	788
ASIAN	-----	7.81	-----	16.50	-----	4.58	-----	13.89	-----	8.87
	-----	232	-----	232	-----	232	-----	231	-----	232

	Attend ballet		Visit art exhibit		Perform on musical instrument		Perform: act/sing/dance		Read fiction	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	4.64	4.72	23.94	24.14	4.01	2.98	4.68	4.27	60.19	59.66
	13913	10878	13905	10872	13916	10879	13916	10879	13868	10852
BLACK	1.78	2.14	12.47	10.71	3.35	1.72	4.87	3.49	42.41	43.34
	1657	1385	1656	1385	1658	1385	1658	1385	1651	1381
HISPANIC	4.54	3.21	16.22	18.18	3.11	2.03	2.85	2.63	36.45	41.46
	941	790	941	790	941	790	941	790	938	788
ASIAN	-----	6.22	-----	26.02	-----	3.82	-----	4.00	-----	53.73
	-----	232	-----	232	-----	232	-----	232	-----	230

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during twelve months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, Asian-Americans were included in an "Other" racial category.

participation rates during the previous month were low for all groups, we focus here on whether or not respondents reported engaging in each activity during the year before the survey was administered./2 The way in which this question was phrased means that we do not know whether members of different groups who answered affirmatively differed in their frequency of participation over the course of the year. The respondent who attended a single play during the previous year, for example, is treated no differently than one who attended twenty.

We report the percentage of the members of different groups who participate. This is very different from the percentage of visits or attendances for which members of each group account. Previous research indicates that a relatively few people account for a large proportion of visits to museums and attendance at performing-arts events because they go very frequently./3 If one's primary interest is in these high attenders, the data reviewed here are of limited value. On the other hand, earlier studies and SPPA evidence

---

2/ A second reason for focussing on the annual rather than the monthly rates is the evidence reported by John Robinson and his colleagues that respondents' recollections "telescoped" their annual attendance into the previous month, thus making the monthly estimates less reliable than the annual ones. See John P. Robinson, Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, and Timothy A. Triplett, Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey, Report of the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Arts, October, 1985, pp. 227-29.

3/ Paul DiMaggio, Michael Useem and Paula Brown, Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums: A Critical Review, Research Division Report #9 (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1978), pp. 37-38.

on participation during the previous month suggest that high attenders represent only a small minority of the American population. Thus for the purpose of comparing groups within that population the limitation is less serious.

We can make several generalizations about responses to core questions for 1982 and 1985. First, the absolute differences between groups with respect to core activities are relatively small, with spreads of from one tenth of one percent (Hispanic ballet attendance in 1982) to, at most, almost 24 percent (Hispanic fiction reading in 1982) between minority groups and the white majority. For the most part, absolute percentage differences are low because relatively few members of any group participate in the core activities (aside from reading literature). For example, the largest percentage of any group that attended opera was the 4.58 percent of Asian Americans in 1985. The highest rate of visiting art galleries and museums was 26.02 percent (again for Asian Americans in 1985). Participation rates for other activities were intermediate.

Taking just those groups for which data are available for both years (whites, Blacks, and Hispanics), we see that participation rates were higher for whites in both years for all but attendance at jazz concerts. Taking not the absolute margins of difference but rather the odds ratios, we see that for some activities these differences were sizable. For example, in both years, whites were more than twice as likely as Blacks to report attending a classical-music con-

cert, an opera performance, a musical-theatre performance, a play, or a ballet; and in 1985 they were more than twice as likely to report visiting an art gallery or museum. Non-Hispanic whites were also more than twice as likely as Americans of Hispanic origin to report attending a play (in both years) and in 1985 attending a classical-music concert or an opera performance./4 Hispanic respondents reported rates of attendance comparable to those of whites to jazz concerts, operas and ballet in 1982, although the gap widened slightly in 1985.

Inspecting ratios of the probability of participation in many core activities for white respondents to the probability of participation for minority respondents makes the differences between groups look large. We can turn the measure around and look, instead, at the ratio of the probability that minority respondents do not participate in an activity to the probability that whites do not participate. Viewed this way, the same intergroup differences seem much smaller. For example, in 1982 whites were well over twice as likely as Blacks (a big difference) to have attended an opera; but Blacks were only 2 percent more likely than whites (a tiny difference) to have abstained from opera attendance. Similarly, in 1985, white respondents were twice as likely as Hispanic respondents to have attended a classi-

---

4/ For the sake of simplicity, we shall drop the modifier "non-Hispanic" when referring to whites and Blacks throughout this report. The reader should recognize that this modifier is implicit in the remainder of the report.

cal music performance; but Hispanics were only 9 percent more likely than whites not to have attended.

Responses of Asian Americans, which became available in 1985, resemble those of white Americans. (Unfortunately, so few Asian respondents were included in the survey that we cannot be as confident that the percentages reflect actual population distributions.) Asian respondents were somewhat more likely than whites to attend classical music concerts, operas, and ballet performances, and to visit art galleries and museums. They were less likely than whites to attend jazz concerts, musical theatre, and stage plays, but white rates of attendance were in all cases less than 50 percent greater than those of Asians.

Rates of public performance were lower than those for attendance at arts events for members of all groups, and these rates varied less among the groups than those for attendance. Blacks were more likely than others to report singing, acting, or dancing on stage in 1982 (but not in 1985), and Asians were more likely to report performing publicly on a musical instruments than any other group in 1985. Hispanics were somewhat less likely than others to report performing on stage, but the absolute margin of difference is very small.

We may infer from this that artistic participation is more equal among ethnic groups with respect to performing than with respect to watching other people perform. This is possible, but we would also note that the wording of the

performance questions was somewhat broader than for the attendance questions, covering any kind of public performance in any musical, dramatic, or dance style. Respondents who answered the music performance question affirmatively, were then asked if they performed classical music and if they performed jazz. One quarter of the white music performers and one fifth of the Hispanic reported that they had played classical music, compared to just one in ten of the Black musical performers in 1982. (In 1985, the comparable figures were 71 percent for Asians, 32 percent for whites, 24 percent for Hispanics and 19 percent for Blacks.) In 1982, more than one quarter of the Hispanics and more than one fifth of the whites who reported performing on an instrument in public said that they had played jazz, compared to just 16 percent of the Black instrumentalists. (In 1985, the comparable proportions were 36 percent for Hispanics, 26 percent for whites, 17 percent for Blacks, with no Asian reporting a public performance of jazz.)

Instrumentalists who performed in public but played neither classical music nor jazz presumably were playing either folk or ethnic music or some form of commercial popular music. Thus we can infer that in 1982, 77 percent of Black instrumentalists, compared to 63 percent of whites and 70 percent of Hispanics played exclusively commercial popular or folk/ethnic music. (In 1985, the figures were 704 percent for Blacks, 55 percent for whites, 57 percent for Hispanics, and 29 percent for Asians.) Had the question

been restricted to classical music and jazz, as were many questions in the SPPA, ratios of white to Black participation rates would have been higher, and Hispanic participation rates would have exceeded those of Blacks. These results serve well to illustrate how the size and direction of inter-group differences may be influenced by the ways in which "the arts" are defined.

Although the music-performance question is unusual in permitting inference about participation in popular commercial art forms, other options do vary in the extent to which they focus upon traditionally prestigious high-culture activities. Are racial and ethnic differences greater with respect to traditional forms of high culture and slimmer for more contemporary or commercial forms? The gaps between whites and Asians, on the one hand, and Hispanics and Blacks, on the other, is striking with respect to classical music and, to a lesser extent, opera and art exhibits. But the gap between whites, on the one hand, and Blacks and Hispanics on the other is also sizable with respect to stage plays and musical theatre presentations, often seen as more popular events; and differences between whites and Hispanics in ballet attendance are relatively modest. Thus responses to the core questions defy generalization on this issue.

Although Black Americans report the lowest participation levels with respect to most of the attendance activities, they report the highest rates of attendance at jazz concerts. Jazz is notable because it is the single art form

included in the core questions that has emerged out of the Black American experience; and, although jazz attendance is a minority pursuit among Blacks and jazz has established itself within American music more broadly, Black artists are still especially prominent as composers and musicians. (The jazz audience is predominantly white, but that is because there are so many more white Americans than Black Americans./5) Blacks were more than 60 percent more likely than whites to report attending a jazz concert in 1982, and more than 35 percent more likely to do so in 1985. This anomalous finding is important, for it shows that the gap between Blacks and Whites with respect to other kinds of attendance does not reflect a generalized indisposition towards performing-arts attendance within the Black subsample.

Differences in Core Participation Among Hispanic Ethnic Groups

We have noted that the Hispanic-origin population is diverse and consists of several groups that vary with respect to such demographic attributes as age and formal educational attainment. To what extent do these subgroups vary in their participation in the core activities of the SPPAs?

It would appear that there is substantial variation within this subgroup, although the small numbers of Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Hispanic respondents limit the con-

---

5/ For a careful analysis of responses to the SPPA questions about jazz, see Harold Horowitz, The American Jazz Music Audience (Washington, D.C. National Jazz Service Organization, 1986).

Table 2-2: Participation in Core Activities
by Hispanic-Origin Ethnic Groups, 1982 and 1985

	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Other	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Jazz	6.40	6.45	2.02	11.04	5.74	4.41	8.78	8.27
Classical	7.57	5.03	2.89	6.41	8.36	0.00	9.65	11.46
Opera	1.44	0.24	2.40	2.03	8.86	3.85	5.95	0.91
Musical	10.91	6.53	5.84	17.53	12.46	6.23	12.62	21.05
Play	3.62	4.83	3.80	6.57	7.35	3.85	11.97	13.29
Ballet	4.35	2.08	1.79	1.27	7.27	0.00	7.75	7.22
Art Ex.	13.44	15.43	16.84	18.35	18.40	12.07	19.82	29.49
Perform: Music	2.09	2.50	2.05	0.00	8.97	0.00	0.65	2.55
Perform: Sing, etc.	2.23	2.12	3.99	.0.00	4.42	0.00	0.82	1.46
Read	29.22	37.70	34.72	39.63	29.31	42.65	48.93	57.42
N	425	382	98	62	47	22	143	131

N for Mexican-Americans in 1982 is 424 for attending operas and musicals. N for Mexican-Americans in 1985 is 380 for jazz and opera, 381 for plays. N for Other in 1985 is 130 for plays. Ns are unweighted, percentages are weighted.

fidence with which we can generalize. (See Table 2-2.) The 1982 SPPA included data from 425 Mexican-Americans, but only 98 Puerto Ricans, 47 Cuban-Americans, and 143 Hispanics with other national backgrounds. Evidence from the 1985 survey is even more limited, with 382 Mexican-American respondents, but just 62 Puerto Ricans, only 22 Cuban-Americans, and 131 in the "other Hispanic" category.

In both 1982 and 1985, respondents in the "other" category participated in most activities more than members of the named Hispanic ethnic groups, and, especially in 1985, their pattern of participation was similar to that of non-Hispanic whites. In 1982, Cuban-American respondents also reported high levels of participation relative the Hispanic subsample as a whole, but in 1985, they did not, except with respect to reading literature. Puerto Rican and Mexican-American respondents tended to report lower levels of participation, although the former were relatively more active in 1985 than in 1982.

These differences are both suggestive and consistent with what we know about differences in age and educational attainment among these segments of the heterogeneous Hispanic-American community. But without systematic sampling of larger numbers of Hispanic respondents, we can treat these findings only as bases for hypotheses to be explored in future research.

Participation in Other Artistic Activities

An additional set of questions was asked approximately one third of the respondents in 1982 and one sixth in 1985. Several of these questions focussed on visual and craft arts, and on activities that involved making art rather than consuming it. This set of questions also asked respondents if they had read or listened to poetry, visited historical or science museum, or visited historical monuments.

Weighted participation rates by race/ethnicity are reported in Table 2-3. Whites were substantially more likely to participate in the attendance activities and creative writing than Hispanics, who were somewhat more likely to do so than Blacks. For visiting history or science museums and historical monuments, differences in Black and white rates were substantial. In 1985, for example, 26 percent of white respondents, but just 11 percent of Black Americans attended a science or history museum. More than 40 percent of the white Americans, but just 18 percent of the Blacks visited an historical monument.

White respondents were more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to report attending arts or craft fairs in the previous year: 43 percent of whites in 1982 and 45 percent in 1985, compared to 27 and 26 percent for Hispanics and just 17 and 15 percent for Blacks. By contrast, whites were only somewhat more likely to have read or listened to poetry.

Data were available from only 37 Asian Americans, too few for confident statistical inference, so participation

Table 2-3: Participation in Other Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Visit non-art museum		Visit hist. monument		Read/listen poetry		Arts/craft fair		Take art lessons	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	24.06	26.08	40.19	40.09	20.66	20.37	43.18	44.56	11.12	10.98
	3461	1860	3462	1858	3461	1854	3462	1857	3462	1859
BLACK	13.20	11.23	21.68	17.50	15.12	14.16	17.14	15.41	8.08	7.03
	416	249	417	248	417	248	417	249	417	249
HISPANIC	21.09	16.26	26.99	23.95	16.83	14.83	26.50	26.03	10.60	6.92
	186	144	185	144	186	142	186	142	186	143
ASIAN	-----	16.57	-----	31.06	-----	20.17	-----	43.71	-----	15.56
	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37

	Work with pottery		Weave, crochet		Creative writing		Photography, film		Paint or Draw	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	13.29	12.68	33.58	30.67	6.70	6.73	11.05	10.67	10.34	9.54
	3463	1857	3463	1857	3463	1857	3461	1856	3463	1859
BLACK	6.93	5.42	22.97	15.58	5.72	4.56	8.01	8.54	7.59	5.04
	417	249	417	249	416	249	417	248	417	249
HISPANIC	8.82	8.95	22.20	16.48	6.97	4.00	7.91	5.23	8.80	9.01
	186	144	186	144	186	144	185	144	186	143
ASIAN	-----	4.14	-----	38.74	-----	3.02	-----	7.71	-----	7.70
	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during twelve months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, Asian-Americans were included in an "Other" racial category (not included).

rates for this group are suggestive at best. Asian respondents attended art and craft fairs and read or listened to poetry at roughly the same rates as whites. Their attendance at science and history museums was comparable to that of Hispanics, whereas their rate of visiting historical monuments fell between the white and Hispanic levels.

The percentages of the Black, white, and Hispanic groups that attended science or history museums -- and the differences in those rates -- were similar to patterns for attendance at art galleries and museums. This suggests that the latter differences have as much to do with museum visiting per se as with the content or exhibits of art museums.

Other activities covered in this section of the SPPA were creative pastimes that individuals could pursue in private: taking lessons in writing, music, arts, dance or crafts; working with pottery, ceramics, jewelry, leather, or metal; practicing a needlecraft (weaving, sewing or others); creative writing; photography, film or video "as an artistic activity"; and painting, drawing, sculpture or printmaking. (Respondents were also asked if they had worked backstage at musical or other kinds of performances, but so few had that we do not report these results here.)

Most intergroup differences with respect to these creative activities were strikingly small. In 1985, for example, 11 percent of the white respondents, compared to 7 percent of both Blacks and Hispanics reported taking art lessons; 7 percent of the whites, 5 percent of the Blacks and 4

percent of the Hispanics engaged in creative writing; 10 percent of the whites, 5 percent of the blacks and 9 percent of the Hispanics created in the visual and plastic arts. In 1982 Hispanics were somewhat more likely to report creative writing than whites. Whites were twice as likely as Hispanics to report art photography and film-making in 1985, but not in 1982. Asian responses were high to moderate.

Differences were greater for creative activity in the craft arts, both needlecrafts and other crafts. Whites were 50 percent more likely than both Blacks and Hispanics in 1982, and almost twice as likely in 1985, to report sewing, weaving or similar activities. They were almost twice as likely in 1982 and more than twice as likely in 1985 as Blacks, and about 50 percent more likely than Hispanics in both years to report working with pottery, ceramics, or comparable materials. This pattern suggests that with respect to <u>making</u> the visual or plastic arts, rates of minority participation relative that of the white majority is no higher, and in fact may be lower, for the craft arts than for more prestigious creative activities like drawing, photography or painting. The data as a whole indicate that minority-group members are less likely to attend cultural institutions, relative whites, than to be found in the ranks of amateur creative artists. Nonetheless, the tendency of white Americans to participate at higher rates than others manifests itself in responses to most of these questions.

Use of the Media for Exposure to the Arts

A subset of respondents to the SPPAs (approximately one quarter in 1982 and approximately one sixth in 1985) were asked if they had, during the past year, seen or heard a jazz performance, a classical-music performance, an opera, a musical-theatre production, a stage play, a ballet performance, or a visual-arts program on television and, where appropriate, radio or sound recording. These questions are of particular interest for two reasons. First, policy makers have viewed the media, especially television, as an important means of increasing exposure to art forms that have benefited from public subsidy. To the extent that participation by minorities in consuming the arts via media is greater relative the white majority than their attendance at live performances, many would regard such an apparent equalization of one kind of artistic opportunity as another benefit of programs that promote the arts on television and radio.

Second, a comparison of differences in the use of media arts programs by different groups with those intergroup differences that emerge when we look at attendance at live events and exhibitions may provide clues as to the origins of the latter differences. Nearly all American families own television sets, and nearly all television sets receive one or more public television stations, which tend to broadcast fine-arts programming. As such, consumption of the arts on television (or radio) is costless, except in time. Roughly

Table 2-4: Use of Media for Arts Consumption by Race/Ethnicity

	Watch jazz on TV		Listen jazz on radio		Listen jazz records		Classical music on tv		Classical radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	16.91	14.97	15.78	15.47	18.42	17.03	26.04	24.89	20.49	22.01
	3288	1705	3281	1699	3260	1695	3287	1709	3276	1703
BLACK	27.95	37.94	36.01	32.42	36.62	36.45	15.68	21.88	15.40	17.49
	366	186	366	186	361	186	366	187	364	187
HISPANIC	16.06	15.05	17.45	19.43	18.76	16.18	21.66	18.59	19.90	18.05
	203	123	201	124	201	124	203	124	201	124
ASIAN	-----	24.85	-----	35.90	-----	19.71	-----	41.86	-----	38.51
	-----	37	-----	36	-----	36	-----	37	-----	36

	Classical records		Opera on TV		Opera on radio		Opera records	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	23.54	22.49	12.45	12.78	7.35	7.03	8.23	8.19
	3264	1698	3288	1710	3269	1702	3281	1709
BLACK	13.24	15.48	9.32	9.97	5.32	4.36	3.94	4.31
	362	186	366	187	363	187	366	186
HISPANIC	15.58	11.03	9.71	12.70	5.26	6.17	3.18	3.03
	200	123	203	123	201	124	202	124
ASIAN	-----	46.63	-----	25.16	-----	11.04	-----	14.10
	-----	36	-----	37	-----	36	-----	37

	Musical Theatre on TV		Musical Theatre on radio		Musical Theatre records		Stage Play on TV		Stage Play on radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	21.04	17.43	4.22	4.92	9.53	8.24	27.86	22.91	3.90	3.93
	3279	1707	3275	1700	3271	1697	3284	1707	3272	1695
BLACK	17.21	17.82	4.44	2.80	1.89	5.07	18.21	18.60	2.67	3.90
	366	186	366	186	365	185	366	186	361	183
HISPANIC	17.83	17.67	4.09	6.50	3.40	3.00	14.58	15.38	6.54	3.34
	203	124	201	124	200	124	203	124	199	123
ASIAN	-----	40.12	-----	14.10	-----	19.39	-----	25.45	-----	0.00
	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37	-----	37

Table 2-4 (con.)

	Ballet on TV		Art on TV	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	16.98	15.00	23.74	26.75
	3278	1707	3275	1706
BLACK	10.34	15.66	19.48	23.62
	365	187	366	187
HISPANIC	15.09	16.58	16.37	18.40
	203	123	202	124
ASIAN	-----	40.92	-----	38.02
	-----	37	-----	37

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during twelve months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, the "Other" category included Asian-Americans, whereas in 1985 it did not. For the media questions, which were asked during only two months of 1985, only two respondents were in the "Other" category, too few to warrant reporting results.

speaking, if intergroup differences are simply a matter of taste, we should not expect them to be much reduced when we compare viewing a kind of art on television to attending the same activity in person. If they are reduced, this suggests that lower levels of live attendance may reflect not simply differences in taste, but differences in the resources necessary to attend or in the comfort felt in live performance and exhibition venues.

The results (Table 2-4) are striking in two respects. First, more people encountered the arts about which the SPPA asked through the media than in live settings. Persons in every racial or ethnic group in each year were more likely to see a jazz concert, a classical-music presentation, an opera performance, a stage play, or a performance of ballet on television (and in the case of the first three, to hear such an event on radio or home sound recording) than to attend a live event. This tendency was less pronounced for musical theatre (which, in 1985, a slightly larger proportion of the white sample reported seeing live than on television) and for the visual arts (for which white and Hispanic, but not Black, television viewing were roughly comparable to attendance at galleries or museums).

Second, and more important for our purposes, the proportionate gap between white and minority attendance was smaller in consumption of the arts through the media than in live attendance. The only exceptions to this point were jazz, where Blacks were even more likely than whites to re-

port participation for jazz on television, radio and record than for live performances; and the substantial gaps between Asians and all other groups in media-linked consumption of classical music, opera, musical theatre, ballet and the visual arts. (The evidence on Asian Americans is intriguing, but inconclusive because the number of respondents [37] is so small.) In other words, although members of all groups were more likely to watch the core-question arts than to attend them, this tendency was more pronounced in the case of minority-group members than in the case of whites.

Consider a few examples from 1985. That year, 14 percent of white respondents, compared to 6 percent of Blacks and 7 percent of Hispanics, reported attending classical music concerts. By contrast, 25 percent of the whites, compared to 22 percent of the Blacks and 19 percent of the Hispanics reported watching classical music on television. In other words, in 1985 whites were twice as likely as Hispanics and more than twice as likely as Blacks to attend a classical concert; but only 14 percent more apt than Blacks and only 32 percent more likely than Hispanics to watch one on television. That same year, whites were more than twice as likely as Blacks, and about 50 percent more likely than Hispanics to attend a ballet performance. By contrast, slightly larger proportions of both minority groups watched ballet on television than did whites.

These findings are notable for two reasons. First, they tell us that the media, especially television, have

done much to ensure that Black and Hispanic Americans are nearly as likely as whites to expose themselves to classical music, opera, musical theatre, drama, ballet and the visual arts. Second, they indicate that a substantial proportion (albeit a minority) of Blacks and Hispanics who do not attend such events in person are sufficiently interested to watch them on television. This finding suggests the potential for minority audience development by museums and performing-arts institutions, and leads one to ask why Black and Hispanic Americans who view the arts on television do not attend them live. Do intergroup differences in attendance reflect differences in opportunity as well as taste?

The implications of these data are inconclusive for four reasons. First, attending a live event requires more commitment than watching a similar program on television. To do the former one must spend time in transit, usually pay some money, and face embarrassment if one wishes to leave. By contrast, one can view the arts on television free of charge and without preparation, and leave a performance by flicking the channel switch. We do not know how many respondents who reported watching opera on television, for example, did so intently or repeatedly; and how many simply spent a few minutes watching an opera into which they bumped while changing channels. People who watch fine-arts events on television but not in person may have less interest than those who see them live, albeit more interest than persons who neither watch nor attend such activities.

Second, it is necessary to disentangle watching televised arts programs from television viewing more generally. There are times when most of us simply want to watch television, and are relatively indifferent to what is on. Blacks and Hispanics, on average, watched more television than Whites. Did their relatively high consumption of televised arts programming simply reflect a greater propensity to watch television programs of any kind?

Analyses described in chapter 5 (Appendix Tables 5-7 and 5-14) indicate that this was not the case. For the full sample, overall television watching has a small, significant positive effect on the number of kinds of arts program a respondent watched; but even with that measure controlled, Blacks and Hispanics watch slightly more arts television than comparable whites. Separate analyses on Black, Hispanic and white subsamples indicate that within each group, general television watching has no significant impact on viewing arts television, with appropriate controls.

Third, we do not know if the musical performances, plays, or dance presentations that people watch on television are similar to the ones they attend live. It may be that some Blacks and Hispanics are more likely to watch arts events on television than to attend them because they prefer the specific programs on television to those available in their communities.

Finally, these data tell us nothing about the quality of the televised arts experience. Many would argue that te-

levision simply cannot capture the sound of a symphony hall or the texture and color of a visual-art work. Others would contend that attending an arts event represents a statement of social membership that solitary consumption cannot duplicate. We have no data that bear on these issues, which are probably outside the domain of social-science research. Nonetheless, if one holds to either of these views, a world in which Black and Hispanic Americans disproportionately experience the arts via media whereas white Americans attend them disproportionately in person does not seem equitable. By contrast, if one believes that it is good for people to have contact with the arts forms about which they were asked in the media questions, and either that arts events are as rewarding televised as live or that watching such events on television will lead to attendance, then these findings are encouraging./6

We explored these issues further by comparing the percentage of respondents in each group who watched a given kind of arts program on TV who also attended comparable live events to the percentage of nonviewers attending. For all groups, people who watched an arts program on television were more likely than others to attend comparable live

---

6/ We know that people who watch an art form on television are more likely than those who do not to attend it in person; but, without data over time on the same people, we cannot divine whether this is the case because television viewing leads to attendance, because attenders are more likely to watch arts programming on television, or because attending live events and watching the arts on television are caused by some third set of factors.

events. (See Appendix Tables 2-2 and 2-3.) In some cases the tendency was slight: for example, in 1982, Hispanic respondents who watched jazz programs on television were only 6 percent more likely than those who did not to go to live jazz events. By contrast, Hispanic respondents who watched classical music programs were more than 10 times as likely in 1982 to attend live classical music performances than were those who did not.

A tendency for arts viewing and attending to be more closely associated for Blacks and Hispanics than for whites, with smaller intergroup differences for viewers than for nonviewers, was evident in both 1982 and 1985 for Hispanic respondents with respect to classical music, musical theatre, ballet and art, and for Black respondents with respect to opera and musical theatre. These findings may indicate that for these art forms television has served to develop an appetite for live attendance among new minority audiences. On the other hand, they could mean that Black and Hispanic attenders of these events are more likely than whites to pursue their interest by watching them on television; or that watching these arts on television is more closely associated with other characteristics that lead to live attendance among Blacks and Hispanics than among whites. Given the small number of Black and Hispanic respondents upon whom these findings are based, caution demands that they be regarded as no more than the basis for hypotheses to be pursued in future surveys.

Musical Preferences

We have hypothesized that more fine-grained definitions of art forms or genres vary more markedly with race and ethnicity than categories that are broadly defined. During certain months, the SPPA asked respondents if they liked to listen to each of a range of musical genres: classical, opera, show tunes, jazz, soul/blues, big band, country western, bluegrass, rock, easy listening, folk, barbershop and hymns or gospel. (Even so, the question did not include such genres as rap, salsa, mariachi, cajun, old timey, reggae or polka, for which even greater racial or ethnic variation in taste might be expected.) Although the question is not, strictly speaking, about participation, it provides an opportunity to investigate intergroup differences in taste for a wider range of musical genres than that about which the core or other participation questions ask.

Responses are described in Table 2-5. Intergroup differences are summarized by the correlations at the bottom of that table. Correlations between groups for 1982 are below the diagonal, for 1985 above it. Correlations on the diagonal describe the relationship between each group's own responses for 1982 and 1985. A correlation is a measure of association, in this case between the percentages of each group who reported liking each kind of music, that ranges from -1.0 to +1.0. If tastes were perfectly coincident, the correlation would be 1.0. If they were totally opposed, it would be -1.0.

Table 2-5: Percentage Reporting that They Enjoy Specific Musical Genres, by Race/Ethnicity, 1982 and 1985

	Whites		Blacks		Hispanics	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Classical	29.45	27.13	15.74	12.61	25.68	31.32
Opera	10.41	11.52	5.74	7.05	5.51	10.29
Show tunes	25.60	26.77	12.25	12.32	15.51	23.23
Jazz	24.52	30.19	43.23	57.82	26.67	41.57
Soul/blues	23.07	28.87	61.14	72.45	28.74	34.80
Big band	35.69	35.28	18.53	20.94	23.91	21.52
Country	63.68	57.46	24.65	27.10	49.26	52.95
Bluegrass	28.27	27.59	5.07	3.02	9.51	15.85
Rock	36.71	43.17	29.59	32.29	37.49	51.01
Easy listening	52.39	54.85	24.93	43.17	40.30	46.29
Folk	28.00	27.43	8.72	13.66	18.01	19.93
Barbershop	16.70	17.53	4.60	2.88	5.18	7.67
Hymns/gospel	34.30	38.30	64.49	65.05	16.40	26.61
N	4518	1758	532	156	277	113

Correlations	White	Black	Hispanic
White	.97	.41	.84
Black	.18	.97	.56
Hispanic	.86	.37	.96

Pearson correlations. 1985 above diagonal, 1982 below. Diagonal=correlation between 1982 and 1985 for each group. Correlations subject to rounding error. Z-scores presented in Appendix Table 2-1.

The diagonal correlations indicate that the musical tastes of each group were highly consistent between 1982 and 1985. Correlations between the tastes of white and Hispanic respondents were also very high in both years. (Both whites and Hispanics favored country western music above any other genre, both liked easy listening music, and few in either group enjoyed opera.)

In 1982, the correlation between Black and white tastes was .18, positive but nonetheless considerably weaker than any other association in the table. Blacks were less likely than whites to report enjoying classical or chamber music, and whites were less likely than Blacks to report enjoying jazz. The largest differences between the groups, however, had to do with soul/blues, country western, easy listening and hymns or gospel music. For example, more than 60 percent of Black respondents, but fewer than one in four of the white reported liking soul or blues music. Less than one quarter of the Blacks but almost two third of the whites enjoyed country western. More than half the whites but fewer than one in four Blacks liked easy listening music. About one third of the white respondents, but almost two thirds of the Black respondents, enjoyed hymns or gospel music. Sizable minorities of white respondents, but very few Black respondents, reported enjoying folk or bluegrass music. Although whites were 80 percent more likely than Blacks to report that they liked opera, the two groups were similar in that few respondents, Black or white, reported

enjoying this form. In 1985, the Black/white correlation (based on a smaller sample than in 1982) rose substantially to .41. Most of the increase resulted from a marked rise in the proportion of Black respondents who reported that they enjoyed easy listening music, although there was some slight convergence in taste for opera, big band, country western, folk, and hymns or gospel music as well.

Correlations between Hispanic and Black tastes were midway between those between Blacks and whites, .37 in 1982 and .56 in 1985. Like whites, Hispanics tended to enjoy country western and easy listening music, and were less likely than Blacks to report enjoying soul music or blues. Like Blacks, they were less likely than whites to like big band music or, in 1982, show tunes and bluegrass. Hispanic respondents reported liking hymns or gospel music less than either Blacks or whites.

These results indicate notable differences associated with race or ethnicity in a national musical culture dominated by commercially produced genres. On the one hand, Black Americans are particularly supportive of forms like jazz, soul or blues, and gospel that have deep roots in the Black experience; and relatively uninvolved in such forms as bluegrass, barbershop or, relative others, country western music, that are associated with white subcultures. But even genres associated with specific racial or ethnic communities appear to have permeated our national musical culture. Thus approximately one in four whites liked jazz and soul/blues,

and an equal proportion of Blacks enjoyed country western music. The findings lend support to images neither of racially segmented cultures nor of a homogeneous mass society where racial and ethnic differences have atrophied.

Black Americans were less likely to report liking classical music than white or Hispanic respondents, and opera was enjoyed by only small minorities in any group. In 1985, Hispanics were more likely than whites to report enjoying classical music, ranking it sixth among the thirteen genres, higher than whites, who ranked it tenth, or Blacks, for whom it ranked ninth. It is thus striking that in 1985 Hispanics were only one half as likely as whites to have reported attending classical-music concerts.

Socialization into the Arts

Advocates of arts education sometimes assert that appreciation of the arts must be cultivated from childhood if one is to understand and care about them as an adult. Sociologists sometimes refer to the familiarity with the fine arts with which educated parents endow their children as "cultural capital," analogous to bequests of financial capital as a means to ensure that one's children get ahead in life./7 If

---

7/ Pierre Bourdieu, Distinction (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); Paul DiMaggio, "Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students," American Sociological Review 47 (1982): 189-201; Paul DiMaggio and John Mohr, "Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection," American Journal of Sociology 90 (1985): 1231-61; and Harry B. G. Ganzeboom, "Cultural socialization and social reproduction: A cross-national test of Bourdieu's

this emphasis on early artistic experiences is justified, then it is possible that intergroup differences in artistic participation reflect differences in the way that children of these groups were socialized.

Fortunately, the SPPAs asked a portion of the respondents (about one third in 1982 and approximately one sixth in 1985) about their socialization experiences with respect to a variety of art forms. Four questions concerned socialization by parents "when you were growing up." Respondents were asked if their parents "often, occasionally, or never" listened to classical music, took them to art museums or galleries, took them to plays, dance, or classical music performances, or encouraged them to read books "which were not required for school or religious studies." Responses to these questions are presented in Table 2-6.

People often have difficulty recalling events that happened in their distant past, and we all have some tendency to reconstruct our childhoods so as to make them consistent with our subsequent experience. We do not know whether such distortions bias the responses affirmatively or negatively, or whether, by contrast, individual distortions more or less balance one another out. To the extent we are interested in comparisons between groups, we need be concerned less by absolute bias than by the possibility that responses from different racial or ethnic categories are flawed by differ-

---

theory of stratification," unpublished manuscript, State University of Utrecht, the Netherlands, presented at the August 1986 International Sociological Association World Congress in New Delhi.

Table 2-6: Cultural Socialization in Family by Race/Ethnicity

	Parents listened classical music		Parents took art museums/ galleries		Parents took plays/dance/ classical		Parents encouraged reading	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	32.64	34.19	35.33	36.64	33.05	33.59	40.36	39.08
	4563	1913	4567	1912	4561	1910	4567	1915
BLACK	18.84	22.17	26.86	26.07	26.31	29.13	32.82	37.91
	507	197	508	198	511	194	511	199
HISPANIC	16.56	25.05	22.76	27.09	20.36	23.16	22.26	20.06
	302	140	304	141	302	141	305	141
ASIAN	-----	48.70	-----	43.30	-----	32.86	-----	46.66
	-----	39	-----	39	-----	39	-----	39

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group reporting parents engaged in activity "occasionally or often" (for first three columns) or "often" (for "encouraged reading"). Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, Asian-Americans were in an "Other" category (not included)."

ential degrees (or directions) of biased recall. John Robinson and his colleagues have suggested that question ordering in the SPPA may have made childhood socialization experiences more salient to respondents who had reported engaging in related arts activities. If this were the case, we would expect such tendencies to yield exaggerated differences between whites and members of other groups in the tables that follow./8

White respondents were most likely to report that their parents at least occasionally listened to classical music. In 1982, 33 percent of whites compared to 19 percent of Blacks and 17 percent of Hispanics answered in this way. (In 1985, the figures were 34 percent for whites, 22 percent for Blacks, 25 percent for Hispanics, and 49 percent for Asians. Regrettably, the small number of Asian American respondents prevents us from placing too much stock in the latter arresting figure./9) These differences are comparable to those for attending classical music concerts and

---

8/ John P. Robinson et al., Public Participation in the Arts, p. 368.

9/ The 1985 figures showed an increase for whites, Blacks, and Hispanics in the extent to which parents listened to classical music while the respondents were growing up. Because the question referred to previous parental behavior, which by definition could not have changed between 1982 and 1985, as opposed to respondent behavior (which could have), we do not regard these increases as meaningful ones. None of the differences are statistically significant. Moreover, because the sample was not designed to be representative of Hispanic Americans, it is possible that some portion of that difference, which is the largest, is an artifact of sample composition changes. Because the number of respondents in 1982 was substantially greater than that in 1985, we place more confidence in the results for the earlier year.

greater than those for viewing or listening to classical music programs on television or radio./10

In 1982, white respondents were 32 percent more likely than Blacks to report that their parents took them occasionally or often to art museums or galleries when they were young./11 (1985 results were similar.) In 1982, they were 55 percent more apt to report such experiences than were Hispanic respondents, whereas in 1985 Hispanics were more similar to Black respondents. (More than 40 percent of the Asian respondents -- compared to 37 percent of the whites -- reported such early experience in 1985.) If we compare these results to reports of visits to art museums in the past year (Table 2-1), we see that the gap between white and Black respondents is somewhat greater than we would expect on the basis of these socialization experiences, whereas the difference between white and Hispanic respondents is approximately the same. By contrast, the difference in the proportion of whites and Blacks who report watching visual-arts programming on television is somewhat less than we would expect on the basis of parental socialization.

Because the question was worded to include attendance at plays, dance, or classical music performances, the next

---

10/ Fewer than 10 percent of respondents in any group in either year reported that their parents "often" listened to classical music, though whites were somewhat more likely than members of other groups to give this response.

11/ Fewer than 5 percent of any group in either year reported that their parents "often" took them to art museums or galleries.

question does not admit to straightforward comparison with any of the core participation questions. The responses are comparable to those for parental visits to art museums and art galleries, with approximately one third of the whites in each year, compared to 26 and 29 percent of the Black respondents (1982 and 1985, respectively) and 20 and 23 percent of the Hispanic group reporting that their parents at least occasionally took them to concerts and plays when they were young./12

In 1982, 40 percent of the white respondents, compared to 33 percent of the Black respondents and 22 percent of the Hispanics reported that their parents often encouraged them to do reading that was not required as part of school or religious instruction. (In 1985, with smaller samples, the figures were 39 percent, 38 percent and 20 percent. Of the few Asian respondents, 47 percent reported such parental encouragement.) If we compare these responses to those for the core question on whether respondents had read novels, short stories, poetry or plays during the previous year, we see that the proportionate gaps between Black and white respondents are somewhat greater than one might expect on the basis of responses to the parental encouragement question, whereas the differences between whites and Hispanics are somewhat less.

12/ Whites respondents were more likely than others to report that their parents "often" took them to such events, but fewer than 6 percent of any group in either year reported this frequency.

The SPPAs also asked respondents if they had taken classes or lessons in voice or an instrument, art, acting, ballet, creative writing, craft arts, art appreciation, or music appreciation at various periods in their lives. Table 2-7 reports the proportion that never took each kind of class, as well as the percentage of respondents that took their first class of each kind when they were under the age of 12, between the ages of 12 and 17, and older than 17.

White respondents were more likely each year to report taking each kind of art class or lesson than were Black or Hispanic respondents. Similarly, with just one minor exception, Blacks were more apt to report having taken classes in each area in each year than Hispanics./13 As was the case for other questions asked in only one month of 1985, the number of Asian respondents was too small to yield conclusive results.

Focussing upon 1982, for which the number of Black and Hispanic respondents to these questions was substantially higher than in 1985, the absolute gap between whites and Blacks ranged from 10 percent (50 percent of the whites compared with 40 percent of the Blacks) for vocal or instrumental lessons, to less than 1 percent (22 percent of the whites and 21 percent of the Blacks) for music appreciation courses. The ratio of white to Black participation ranged from two to one (for ballet lessons, taken by 8 percent of

---

13/ The single exception: in 1982, 7.31 percent of the Hispanic respondents as compared to 6.92 percent of the Blacks reported having taken acting lessons.

Table 2-7: Age at First Class or Lesson in Selected Arts Subjects by Race/Ethnicity, 1982 and 1985

	Age at first class	Music class		Art class		Acting class		Ballet class	
		1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	Never	49.51	48.92	74.55	72.16	90.05	89.16	92.00	90.81
	<12	26.30	28.68	3.00	3.93	1.07	1.00	5.57	7.05
	12-17	19.93	18.61	11.41	12.16	6.03	6.73	0.92	0.89
	>17	4.27	3.78	11.04	11.75	2.84	2.56	1.51	1.25
BLACK	Never	59.55	62.96	81.60	82.77	93.08	91.53	96.17	97.04
	<12	13.81	14.23	2.44	0.89	1.02	0.75	1.73	1.14
	12-17	21.23	17.31	11.14	11.98	3.80	6.85	1.04	1.40
	>17	5.41	5.51	4.82	4.36	2.09	0.88	1.05	0.43
HISPANIC	Never	77.65	76.07	82.97	88.71	92.69	95.27	96.56	97.28
	<12	6.38	7.37	2.48	0.00	0.60	0.00	1.85	0.44
	12-17	14.20	11.24	9.97	7.74	4.60	3.79	0.00	1.41
	>17	1.77	5.32	4.59	3.55	2.11	0.94	1.60	0.87
ASIAN	Never	-----	59.88	-----	70.88	-----	88.04	-----	94.59
	<12	-----	15.04	-----	6.44	-----	0.00	-----	0.00
	12-17	-----	8.53	-----	11.76	-----	7.37	-----	2.75
	>17	-----	16.55	-----	10.91	-----	4.59	-----	2.66

Table 2-7 (Con.)

	Creative writing class		Craft art class		Art Appreciation class		Music Appreciation class		Number of Respondents	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
WHITE	80.78	78.94	66.51	62.44	79.31	78.50	78.47	78.27	4590	1923
	0.75	1.07	3.47	4.25	0.81	0.76	2.32	1.95		
	7.51	9.21	15.37	17.95	6.16	6.50	9.02	9.39		
	10.96	10.78	14.66	15.36	13.71	14.24	10.18	10.39		
BLACK	85.60	87.90	76.04	71.79	84.22	83.17	79.10	83.03	515	199
	1.05	0.78	3.57	0.93	0.68	0.30	1.73	1.11		
	6.21	4.37	13.00	15.79	6.02	11.17	11.01	6.73		
	7.14	6.96	7.38	11.49	9.08	5.36	8.16	9.13		
HISPANIC	88.17	95.91	80.08	84.31	88.99	93.06	91.02	93.02	305	143
	0.98	0.00	2.14	2.22	1.09	0.00	1.07	0.44		
	4.71	1.64	12.17	8.99	4.59	4.00	3.54	3.22		
	6.14	2.45	5.61	4.49	5.32	2.94	4.37	3.32		
ASIAN	-----	89.78	-----	81.39	-----	88.89	-----	87.32	-----	39
	-----	0.00	-----	0.00	-----	0.00	-----	4.56		
	-----	5.96	-----	6.45	-----	5.96	-----	8.13		
	-----	4.26	-----	12.15	-----	5.15	-----	0.00		

Note: Figures under class names refer to weighted percentage of group first engaging in activity at age indicated. Last two columns indicate unweighted number of respondents. (Ns for each group for each year were the same for all classes, except that N=4589 for white respondents with respect to writing classes and craft art classes in 1982.) In 1982, Asian-Americans were coded in an category (not included).

the whites and just 4 percent of the Blacks), to 1.03:1, for music appreciation courses. Among class types taken by substantial minorities of all respondents, whites were 38 percent more likely than Blacks to take art classes in the visual arts, 33 percent more apt to report taking creative writing classes, 40 percent more likely to report classes in the craft arts, and 31 percent more likely to report art appreciation classes.

The proportion of Hispanic Americans who indicated that they had taken classes or lessons was comparable to, although slightly lower than, the Black percentage for the visual arts, acting, and ballet. Hispanics were just 62 percent as likely as whites and 82 percent as apt as Blacks to report taking creative writing courses. For craft art courses the comparable figures were 59 percent and 83 percent. For art appreciation courses, they were 53 and 70 percent, respectively. Hispanics were especially unlikely to have taken music lessons or music appreciation courses. Only 22 percent of the Hispanics, compared to 40 percent of the Black and 50 percent of the white respondents reported taking vocal or instrumental classes or lessons. And only 9 percent, as compared with 21 percent of the Black respondents and 22 percent of the whites reported ever taking a course in music appreciation.

The age at which persons first took classes or lessons varied by kind of lesson, with music and ballet lessons often taken during the primary-school years, and music and

art appreciation often taken after the age of 17. Such patterns differed somewhat by race and ethnicity, however. For example, 26 percent of the white respondents, but just 14 percent of the Black respondents, reported taking voice or instrumental lessons before the age of 12. By contrast, Blacks were slightly more likely than whites to take such lessons during the high school years and after the age of 17. Similarly, Blacks were somewhat more likely than whites to take music appreciation courses during the high school years, and somewhat less likely to take them before or after. This pattern of relatively equal Black/white participation during the high school years, and less equal participation before and/or after high school tended also to be the case for other kinds of classes. Although the data are ambiguous because respondents were not asked where they took lessons or classes, the findings do suggest that U.S. secondary schools have tended to equalize access to arts training between white and Black students. They do not seem to have done this for Hispanic Americans, however./14

Whether such classes have had a long-term effect is another issue. If we assume that music appreciation courses

---

14/ It may be that Hispanic Americans have gone to schools where fewer arts courses have been offered or required; that they are less likely than Blacks or whites to take optional arts courses; or that they have in some way been excluded from courses that were available to Blacks or whites. Note, however, that a far higher proportion of Hispanic Americans than of white or Black Americans are immigrants who received their schooling outside of the United States. Unfortunately, data on where respondents were born are not available in the SPPA.

focus on classical music, then the gaps between white and Black Americans in attending classical concerts and watching televised classical music programs are larger, and the differences between Blacks and Hispanics smaller (or in the opposite direction) than that which one would predict on the basis of the music-appreciation responses. This could be the case if Black students took different kinds of courses than whites, or if whites and Hispanics had more opportunities to develop a taste for classical music without taking classes. Blacks are less likely, relative whites, to visit art museums or galleries but more likely to watch visual-arts programs on television than we would expect from the rate at which they have taken art appreciation courses, whereas the white/Hispanic gap in the rate of visiting art exhibits is lower than the art-appreciation data would lead one to predict. The difference between the percentage of whites, on the one hand, and both Blacks and Hispanics, on the other who report that they currently practice creative writing and painting or drawing is less than one would expect on the basis of differences in the proportion of these groups who have taken art or creative writing courses./15

15/ To pursue this issue further, we compared the percentages of Black, Hispanic and white respondents participating in the core consumption items among respondents who did and did not take lessons relevant to each item before the age of 18. (For example, we compared attendance at classical music concerts by respondents who took music appreciation courses to the attendance by those who did not take such courses. See Appendix tables 2-4 and 2-5.) As expected, persons in each group who had taken relevant classes or lessons participated in most activities at higher levels than others. In 1982, the difference between respondents with and without

Summary

The data reported above are too complex to summarize facilely, but one fact emerges clearly. Blacks and Hispanics are statistically underrepresented, relative whites, among those who attend fine-arts events, both performances and exhibitions. They also tend to be less likely than whites to participate in the fine arts by watching them on television and by engaging in amateur practice, but the differences are proportionately smaller than for most kinds of live attendance. White Americans are also more likely than Blacks and much more likely than Hispanics to report that they have been socialized into the fine arts (and reading) by family experience and by classes or lessons. With respect to core participation, the only set of questions for which there were a sizable number of Asian respondents, Asian Americans were notable for their rate of attendance at classical concerts, art exhibits, and

---

lessons was greatest for most activities for Blacks and Hispanics, and the odds ratio of participation between whites and other groups was in most cases lower among persons who had taken lessons or classes, suggesting the possibility that formal instruction tends to depress intergroup differences. (Alternatively, Blacks and Hispanics who reported taking youthful lessons or classes in 1982 may simply have had more of other characteristics that are associated with attendance than did whites who reported having taken lessons.) These differences were not so apparent, however, among respondents to the 1985 SPPA. Because the number of Black and Hispanic respondents is greater in the 1982 SPPA, we have more confidence in those data. But given the discrepancy in results between the two years, it would be incautious to regard the 1982 patterns as any more than bases for hypotheses for further research.

ballet and opera performances, all of which exceeded the white rate.

Despite their superficial similarity in comparison to those of whites, the response patterns of Blacks and Hispanics are distinct. Fewer Hispanics than Blacks reported benefiting from most of the socialization experiences about which respondents were asked. Yet their rates of participation through watching the arts on media were similar to those of Blacks (but higher for classical music and ballet programs), as was their participation in creative practice (with somewhat higher rates for most visual-arts or crafts activities). Hispanics were also more likely than Blacks to visit art exhibits.

These patterns point to relatively low participation of Black Americans as traditional fine-arts attenders and art exhibition visitors that cannot be explained by artistic socialization alone. Moreover, the fact that Blacks attend jazz concerts at higher rates than whites (or Hispanics or Asians) indicates that they are not characterized by low rates of interest or attendance at performing-arts events per se. It is likely that had the SPPA questions emphasized artistic genres that have closer historical links to the Black and Hispanic communities, artistic participation for these groups would have been as high as or higher than that of whites.

Nonetheless, we cannot assume that relatively low rates of Black and Hispanic participation among attenders of fine-

arts events simply reflect lower interest in or liking for such activities. The fact that the proportionate gap between white respondents, on the one hand, and Black and (to a somewhat lesser extent) Hispanic respondents was greater for live attendance than for media participation indicates that there is interest in both the Black and Hispanic populations in the fine arts that is not being manifested in live attendance. Moreover, given the relatively small differences in the proportion of Blacks and whites who take art and, especially, music appreciation courses, the low rates at which Blacks attend classical music concerts, opera and ballet performances, and art exhibits are surprising. Add to this the greater statistical overrepresentation of Blacks relative whites for watching jazz on television and listening to it on radio and sound recordings than for attendance at live concerts, and it appears that some factors other than taste may inhibit the attendance of Black Americans at live performing arts events and art exhibits.

If one believes that the kinds of arts participation about which the SPPA asked are so important that intergroup differences, of whatever origin, are unacceptable, then these findings are of grave concern. If one believes that such intergroup differences are unacceptable only if they reflect differences in opportunity, rather than differences in preferences, then these patterns raise cause for concern, at least with respect to the Black Americans, but do not demonstrate conclusively that such concern is warranted.

The reader should be aware, however, that almost all of the activities about which respondents were asked (except for reading novels, short stories, poetry or plays) are ones in which only a minority of all respondents participated during the year previous to the survey. With respect to many activities (for example attending opera or ballet performances or performing on stage), these minorities were very small ones. If one believes that the goal of policy should be to increase the number of minority Americans engaging in these activities rather than to make participation rates equal, this could be accomplished more effectively for most activities by doubling the current unequal rates of participation of all groups than by bringing Black and Hispanic rates up to white levels.

The findings in this chapter tell us that white, Black, Hispanic and Asian Americans participate in a wide range of artistic activities at unequal rates, but they do not tell us why these differences exist. If one believes that racial or ethnic differences of the sort identified here are only problematic if they seem to be <u>explained</u> by race or ethnicity (as opposed to being just <u>associated</u> with race or ethnicity), then these findings are not sufficient. In Chapter 3, we investigate the <u>net</u> effects of Black and Hispanic origin on SPPA core participation rates, other things equal, and address certain questions that this chapter has posed but not answered.

Chapter 3: Net Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Participation in SPPA Core Activities

In Chapter 2, we observed persistent differences between the rates of participation of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and white Americans in the artistic activities about which the SPPAs asked. Comparison of patterns of response to different questions suggested that, with certain exceptions, differences by race were stronger for live attendance than for arts consumption through the media, stronger for live attendance than for art-producing activities, and stronger for "high culture" performing-arts activities than for jazz or popular-music performance.

It is one thing to establish that racial groups vary in the rates at which they participate in certain cultural activities. It is quite another to demonstrate that these differences result from race or ethnicity, rather than being by-products of other differences between such groups. The major goal of this chapter is to determine the extent to which differences among three racial/ethnic groups - whites, Blacks, and Hispanics - stem from group membership itself, as opposed to originating in differences among these groups in sociodemographic circumstance./1 In other words, we shall ask whether members of these groups would participate

---

1/ We shall ask the same question about Asian-Americans, but there are so few Asian-Americans in the sample that we can answer it with less confidence than for the other groups.

at different rates were they identical with respect to sociodemographic position.

These analyses are both of intrinsic interest and of interest for their relevance to public policy towards the arts (in so far as one regards participation in the activities included in the core questions as sufficiently important that intergroup differences are a matter of concern). If one believes that racial or ethnic differences in participation are objectionable only if they flow directly from race or ethnicity, the results of this chapter will permit one to see to what extent this is the case. If one regards intergroup differences as lamentable whatever their origin, the analyses in this chapter will provide clues as to how they might be modified. (For example, moderating differences in participation stemming from intergroup differences in education or occupational status may require different policy remedies than would lessening differences that are not attributable to such factors.)

We cannot assume, however, that the factors that lead people to participate in the arts are the same for members of different racial or ethnic groups. After exploring the net effects of race and ethnicity on participation, we take the additional step of dividing our samples into three groups -- whites, Blacks, and Hispanics -- and analyzing the sociodemcgraphic determinants of participation in the "core" activities separately for each. These separate analyses permit us to judge the extent to which the same factors

account for variation in participation within each group. The results, should they differ, may suggest that different kinds of programs are necessary to extend opportunities for participation to members of different groups.

We restrict our analyses to the core participation questions because these activities are of particular policy and theoretical interest and, more pragmatically, because they were asked throughout the survey periods, thus yielding large Black and Hispanic subsamples./2 Because these questions cover only a limited range of activities, the findings should not be generalized hastily to other forms of participation in the arts.

Explaining Racial and Ethnic Differences

In this section, we predict participation in each of the core activities as a function of race, ethnicity, and sociodemographic characteristics./3 For each core activity, we executed two predictive models: one including only racial or ethnic origin; and one including racial/ethnic origin and sociodemographic measures. By comparing the size of coefficients estimating the influence of racial or ethnic group membership on participation with and without controls, we

---

2/ In Chapter 5, we shall return to other forms of participation and explore similar questions using different methods and a wider range of variables.

3/ The following description of our approach will be somewhat tedious for the reader unfamiliar with statistical analyses of the type reported here; but reading it is necessary if one is to interpret the tables in this chapter.

can estimate the percentage of intergroup differences for which sociodemographic differences account.

Because the dependent variables -- the participation measures -- are binary, taking the value of "1" if the respondent did participate and "0" if he or she did not, we use a method designed for such variables, called logit or logistic regression analysis. The logit method treats dichotomous dependent variables as reflecting underlying probabilities of participation and uses independent variables to predict these probabilities. The resulting coefficients are maximum-likelihood estimates of the impact of each independent variable on participation, controlling for the influence of all the others./4

Race or ethnicity are included in the models as a series of dichotomous or "dummy" variables, taking the value of "1" when the respondent is a member of the group in question and "0" when he or she is not. To use dummy variables in this way it is necessary to exclude a category. In these analyses, whites are the excluded category. Coefficients for other groups represent the impact of group membership on the probability of participation (net the effects of other independent variables in the model) compared to the participation rates of white respondents. For the 1982 data, we included "Black," "Hispanic," and "Other" as racial/ethnic

---

4/ For a fuller description, see John H. Aldrich and Forrest D. Nelson, Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1984). We used the LOGIST procedure provided by SAS (a statistical package) and developed by Frank E. Harrell, Jr.

categories. (Because we do not know who is in the "Other" category, we do not report results for this group.) In models for 1985, we excluded the very few "Other" respondents from the analyses and included "Black," "Hispanic," and "Asian" as racial/ethnic variables.

Compared to the customary multivariate approach, multiple regression analysis, the results of logit analyses are difficult to interpret. Unfortunately, multiple regression analysis yields undependable estimates of effects when dependent variables are binary and skewed, as are the core participation measures. In chapter 5, we shall use multiple regression in more detailed analyses of direct and indirect effects of race and ethnicity on ordinal scales consisting of several participation measures. But here we wish to focus on each core participation question separately, in order to draw inferences from differences among these questions in the influence of race or ethnicity on participation.

In interpreting these results, we focus upon the coefficients comparing the net participation of each racial or ethnic group in the activity in question. By way of illustration, consider the section of Table 3-1 reporting the effect of being Black on attending classical music concerts in 1982. (These results are reported under 1982 to the right of the rows labeled "B" under the column headed "attends classical concerts.") Column 1 reports the results of the model including only the racial/ethnic dummy variables. Column 2 reports the results of the model including the rac-

Table 3-1: Coefficients Representing Effects of Black (B) and Hispanic (H) on Core Participation Items (1) with Race/Ethnicity only and (2) with Demographic Controls

	jazz		classical		opera		musical		play	
1982	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B b	.631	.683	-.845	-.566	-.900	-.582	-.825	-.567	-.903	-.674
se	.071	.084	.097	.110	.208	.240	.081	.093	.103	.118
sig	c	c	c	c	c	a	c	c	c	c
H b	-.090	.075	-.667	-.071	-.275	.356	-.734	-.314	-.970	-.505
se	.121	.133	.123	.137	.212	.233	.106	.119	.145	.160
sig	NS	NS	c	NS	NS	NS	c	a	c	a
1985	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B b	.381	.453	-.868	-.557	-.715	-.306	-.884	-.562	-.815	-.603
se	.084	.101	.111	.128	.228	.249	.098	.111	.113	.133
sig	c	c	c	d	a	NS	c	c	c	c
H b	-.382	-.272	-.805	-.261	-1.334	-.832	-.753	-.339	-.761	-.359
se	.140	.156	.137	.153	.388	.428	.117	.131	.140	.159
sig	a	NS	c	NS	b	NS	c	a	c	a

	ballet		art		instrument		act, sing		read	
1982	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B b	-.967	-.781	-.774	-.617	-.194	-.191	.040	.042	-.701	-.501
se	.182	.202	.074	.086	.137	.147	.116	.127	.051	.062
sig	c	b	c	c	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	c
H b	-.000	.511	-.486	-.039	-.271	-.352	-.518	-.466	-.951	-.579
se	.161	.179	.090	.104	.191	.217	.199	.212	.070	.084
sig	NS	a	c	NS	NS	NS	a	a	c	c
1985	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B b	-.799	-.536	-.948	-.790	-.547	-.317	-.195	-.043	-.629	-.456
se	.187	.205	.088	.102	.209	.221	.151	.169	.056	.069
sig	c	a	c	c	a	NS	NS	NS	c	c
H b	-.384	.094	-.332	.101	-.381	-.103	-.489	-.293	-.705	-.284
se	.196	.211	.090	.105	.245	.254	.215	.228	.071	.086
sig	a	NS	b	NS	NS	NS	a	NS	c	b

NOTES: b is the logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant.

ial/ethnic dummy variables with sociodemographic controls. Under each column, the row labeled "b" reports the logistic regression coefficient indicating the net influence of being Black on attending classical music concerts. The coefficient in column 1, for example, is -.858. For dichotomous variables like Black or Hispanic status, this coefficient can be interpreted as the log of the odds ratio between Black attendance and that of whites (the omitted category). Because there are no controls in the model reported in column 1, this figure is comparable to the descriptive percentage results reported in Table 3-1. Column 2 reports the effect of being Black on attending classical music concerts, controlling for a wide range of sociodemographic differences between the white and Black respondents. Because the coefficient is less than that in column 1 but nonetheless remains negative, it indicates that part, but not all, of the difference between Blacks and whites is attributable to sociodemographic differences between the two groups. By dividing the coefficient in column 2 (-.570) by the coefficient in column 1, we can conclude that roughly 33 percent of the difference in rates of participation between Blacks and whites resulted from measured sociodemographic differences between the two groups, whereas the remainder stems from other sources.

We shall not discuss the standard error (the figure immediately under the logistic regression coefficient), which is of interest only to statistically sophisticated readers.

Of more general interest is the alphabetical notation below that (in the row labeled "sig"). Probability theory tells us that when one uses a sample from a larger population, one gets some positive or negative coefficients simply by chance. The letters in the significance rows of table 3-1 (keyed to an explanation at the end of the table) tell us how likely it is that a coefficient of a given magnitude would occur by chance. The letter "c" in the significance row of column 2 under classical music (for Blacks in 1982) tells us that such an effect (-.570) would be estimated by chance fewer than 5 times out of 100,000. This is a very high level of statistical significance and enables us to conclude that Blacks really were less likely to attend classical music concerts than whites, as the negative regression coefficient indicates. Note, however, that with sample sizes of the magnitude of those for the SPPAs, substantively small differences will often be statistically highly significant.

Racial/ethnic effects net of sociodemographic influences

In chapter 2 we raised the possibility that differences in participation between whites, on the one hand, and Black and Hispanic Americans, on the other, might result simply from the fact that whites, as a group, are better off. Because educational attainment and occupational status are associated with patterns of leisure activity and interest in the arts, it seemed reasonable to expect that at least some of

the differences we observed stemmed from socioeconomic differences between whites and members of other groups.

We explored this possibility by including race/ethnicity in a predictive model that controlled for a wide range of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: gender; three categories of residence (central city, other SMSA, and outside an SMSA); age; education; income; seven categories of occupation (1982: professional and technical; managerial and administrative; sales and clerical; craft, operative, service, farm, transport, laborers, private household, and armed forces; unknown; unemployed and retired; keeping house; and student; 1985: executive, administrative, managerial; professional; technical, sales and administrative support; craft, operative, service, farm, armed forces; unknown; unemployed and retired; keeping house; and student); and five categories of marital status (married, widowed, divorced, separated, and single)./5

To what extent are differences in participation in the core activities attributable to differences among groups in

---

5/ Education and income, which were categorized in the survey, were recoded to their natural metric (using midpoints of categories where appropriate). Because of changes in the federal occupational classification system between the 1982 and 1985 surveys, the occupational classifications were somewhat different, although occupations were aggregated to maximize comparability between the two years. For residence, the omitted category was "outside SMSA." For occupation, the omitted category in 1982 was "craft, operative, service, farm, transport, laborers, private household, and armed forces"; in 1985, it was "craft, operative, service, farm, armed forces." For marital status, the omitted category was "married."

the sociodemographic controls? No single generalization applies to Black, Hispanic, and Asian respondents.

Variation between Blacks and whites. Differences in participation between Blacks and whites were partially attributable to sociodemographic differences between these two groups; but significant differences tended to persist even in the presence of sociodemographic controls. In both 1982 and 1985, Blacks were significantly less likely than whites, even after controlling for sociodemographic factors, to attend classical music concerts, musical theatre performances, plays, ballet performances, and art exhibitions, and significantly less likely to report reading novels, plays, poems or short stories. (In 1982, but not 1985, significant differences in opera attendance between Blacks and whites remained after controls, as well.) For reading and for attendance at classical music concerts, musical theatre performances, plays, and art exhibits, the differences, net sociodemographic factors, were highly significant. For these activities, there are small but robust differences between Blacks and whites that cannot be attributed to the different sociodemographic characteristics of these two groups.

Nonetheless, introducing sociodemographic controls did diminish the differences in both 1982 and 1985 with respect to each of the activities mentioned above. In 1982, between 20 percent (for ballet) and 36 percent (for opera) of the Black/white differences were attributable to sociodemographic variation between Blacks and whites. In 1985, similar

proportions of the Black/white differential were attributable to sociodemographic variation (from 18 percent for art exhibitions to 37 percent for musical theatre), with the exception that 57 percent of the variation in opera attendance was of sociodemographic origin. In other words, except for opera attendance, less than one half, and in most cases closer to one quarter, of the differences between Black and white probabilities of participation in these activities stem from differences in the sociodemographic characteristics of these groups.

It is instructive to consider the core activities -- jazz concert attendance, public performance on a musical instrument, and acting, singing, or dancing in public -- to which this generalization does not apply. In both years, Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to report attending live jazz concerts, and controlling for sociodemographic characteristics merely increased their advantage, albeit modestly. In both years, whites were slightly more likely to report performing on a musical instrument in public. In 1982, adding sociodemographic controls yielded only a trivial reduction in the small and statistically insignificant difference. In 1985, the gross difference was modestly significant; whereas, with sociodemographic controls, it was not significant at all. For acting, singing, and dancing, neither the gross nor net difference between Blacks and whites was significant in either year.

The pattern that emerges is one of significant differences between Black and white participation in the consumption of mainstream, especially high-cultural, arts activities, both in gross terms and with sociodemographic characteristics controlled. With respect to these activities, a substantial portion but (with one exception) less than half of the difference results from variation between Black and white Americans in sociodemographic factors. By contrast, the greater propensity of Blacks to attend jazz concerts -- the one activity with historical ties to the Black community -- is actually accentuated when sociodemographic differences are controlled. Gross differences between Blacks and whites with respect to performance (including popular or commercial as well as fine-arts forms) are slight; in the one case in which such a difference is modestly significant, it becomes insignificant when sociodemographic factors are taken into account.

This pattern reinforces our conviction that one cannot generalize about racial differences in artistic participation, per se. We suspect that if more art forms with origins in Black America had been included among the core activities, the results would reveal, as was the case for jazz, statistical underrepresentation of white Americans.

It is with respect to attendance at live, noncommercial, high-cultural events, as well as attendance at musical theatre and reading imaginative literature, that whites participate at significantly higher rates than Blacks, even

controlling for demographic differences between the two groups. In other words, Blacks are less likely than whites of similar socioeconomic standing to engage in the public consumption of traditional high culture and related genres.

Although these interracial differences are robust, they are not large in magnitude relative differences associated with other determinants of participation./6 With respect to all of the activities for which being Black significantly depresses participation (relative whites), the direct effect of race is dwarfed by the impact of educational attainment and (except for reading in 1982) exceeded by the effect of family income. Similarly, once other sociodemographic factors are taken into account, participation rates of Blacks and whites are more similar than are rates for men and women for all such activities but visiting art exhibitions; and more similar than rates for inner-city dwellers and persons living outside of SMSAs for all such activities but attending classical-music performances and reading imaginative literature. Thus race is a far less important net predictor of participation in all activities in which Blacks participate significantly less than whites than educational attainment; and, in most cases, a weaker predictor than income,

---

6/ Because logistic regression analyses cannot generated standardized regression coefficients, comparison of effects is less straightforward than for ordinary least squares regression analysis of the kind used in chapter 5. We compare the magnitude of effects by comparing the R statistic for specific independent variables. The R statistic measures the net contribution of each predictor to the model's total explanatory power.

gender, or urban residence. Note, however, that Black Americans earn less money and have historically received fewer years of formal education than comparable whites./7 Therefore, in addition to its direct negative effect, being Black exerts a small indirect negative effect on probability of participation in these core activities because Blacks, through its negative impact on income and education.

Variation between whites and Hispanics. The results for Americans of Hispanic origin lend themselves less easily to generalization. For one thing, no single pattern characterized Hispanic participation in the traditional consumption activities. For another, the influence of Hispanic origin on participation in specific activities varied from year to year. Although the latter differences were not statistically significant, the relatively small size of the Hispanic subsamples and, more important, the fact that the survey was not designed to represent statistically the Hispanic population, make the differences between the 1982 and 1985 results difficult to interpret.

In 1982, Hispanics were significantly less likely than whites to report reading novels and other imaginative works, attending classical music concerts, art exhibits, plays, musical theatre performances; or acting, singing, or dancing on stage. In 1985, they were significantly less likely than

---

7/ William Julius Wilson, The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions, 2nd ed., Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980; Stanley Lieberson, A Piece of the-Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880, Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1980.

whites to report every activity but performing on an instrument in public.

For most of these activities, however, large portions of the Hispanic/white difference stem from differences in the sociodemographic composition of the two groups. Entering sociodemographic controls into the 1982 models, for example, eliminates 89 percent of the differential between whites and persons of Hispanic origin in classical music attendance, 91 percent of the variation in attending art exhibits, 57 percent in attending musical theatre performances, 48 percent in attending stage plays and 39 percent in reading imaginative literature. Indeed, after controlling for these characteristics, rates of Hispanic participation are significantly lower than those of whites for no activities but attending musical theatre performances and plays, and reading imaginative literature (in both years); performing on stage (in 1982); and attending opera (in 1985). In other words, these analyses demonstrate that Americans of Hispanic origin are about as likely as white Americans with similar sociodemographic characteristics to attend ballet, classical music and jazz performances, to visit art exhibits, and to perform on a musical instrument. (Indeed, in 1982, Hispanic respondents were significantly more likely to attend ballet performances than sociodemographically comparable whites.)

Two differences are notable between patterns for Hispanic and Black respondents. First, although participation

rates are roughly comparable for these two groups for most activities, larger proportions of the differences between Hispanics and whites than between Blacks and whites stem from intergroup differences in sociodemographic attributes. By contrast, more of the differences between Blacks and whites reflect differences between the races in tastes, access, or unmeasured characteristics not associated with the sociodemographic controls. What this means is that public policies or historical processes that made Hispanics more similar to whites with respect to such resources as educational attainment, occupation, or earnings would, as a by-product, would minimize many differences in artistic participation as well. So would policies that increased the artistic participation of people with fewer educational, occupational and financial resources, even if those policies were not directed specifically at Hispanic Americans. By contrast, even if Black Americans became more similar to white Americans in their sociodemographic characteristics and even if the link between such characteristics and participation was lessened, Blacks could still be expected to participate slightly but significantly less than whites in several of the core activities.

Hispanics and Blacks also differ with respect to the activities for which these generalizations do not hold. As we have seen, the statistical overrepresentation of whites relative Blacks applies only to traditional arts consumption activities and not to jazz or public performance. By cont-

rast, Hispanic Americans participated at lower rates than whites in both years, net sociodemographic differences, only in reading and in attendance at musical and dramatic theatrical performances. Note that these three activities are the only ones of the ten core activities for which command of the English language is ordinarily essential. Whereas almost all Black and white Americans are native English speakers, a substantial proportion of Hispanic Americans are not. Thus we surmise (although, lacking data on language we cannot be sure) that lower net rates of Hispanic participation in activities involving the printed and spoken word reflect the linguistic characteristics of the Hispanic population and the relatively low availability of performances and imaginative literature in Spanish. Were the availability of such materials increased, we would expect to see Hispanics participate in them at rates comparable to those of whites with similar sociodemographic attributes.

Variation between Asian and white Americans. The 1985 SPPA data set (unlike its 1982 counterpart) made it possible to distinguish between Asian-American and other respondents. Nonetheless, because there were so few Asian respondents (well under 2 percent of the total sample), we cannot report their behavior with much statistical confidence. In models with only race and ethnicity included, Asians were more likely than whites to participate in all the activities that do not rely on the spoken or printed word except attending jazz concerts, and less likely than whites to participate in

those that do. Nonetheless, these differences were small and never statistically significant.

Because Asian-Americans tend to have sociodemographic characteristics that, as a whole, are associated with participation in the core activities, entering sociodemographic controls actually decreased net Asian participation relative that of whites. Thus Asian Americans were significantly less likely than whites in similar sociodemographic circumstances to attend musical or dramatic stage presentations. Differences with respect to other core activities remained statistically insignificant.

Differences in Predictors of Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Built into the analyses reported above is the assumption that the same sociodemographic factors influence the participation of Blacks, Hispanics, and whites in the same ways and to the same extent. This is a useful simplifying assumption because it enables us to estimate net differences in participation. But if we are interested in understanding the factors that lead members of racial and ethnic minorities to participate in the arts activities about which the surveys asked, we must consider the possibility that different groups arrive at participation by different routes.

In order to explore this possibility, we divided our sample into three groups -- Blacks, Hispanics, and whites -- and conducted separate logistic regression analyses predicting each of the core participation measures for each

group./8 (Separate analyses were undertaken using the 1982 and 1985 data, respectively.) These analyses enabled us to estimate the effects of each of a number of sociodemographic characteristics on the probability of participation for members of each group./9

Four of the predictor variables were the same as those used for the analyses of the full sample: gender (1 if female, 0 if male, yielding coefficients interpretable as the impact of being female, net other factors); age; educational attainment in years; and family income in dollars. Three predictors were simplified on the basis of the earlier analyses. Because these analyses showed that, controlling for other sociodemographic attributes, residents of central cities and of SMSA areas outside of central cities both tended to participate significantly more than persons who lived outside of SMSAs, a new variable, taking the value of 1 for persons who lived anywhere in an SMSA and 0 for persons who did not, was created to tap the effects of residence. Because, controlling for other characteristics, divorced and single people both tended to participate in most of the core activities more than people who were married, widowed or separated, such groups were combined into a single variable

---

8/ There were too few respondents of Asian descent to undertake separate analyses for this group.

9/ The results of these analyses are presented in Appendix Table 3-1. Note that the coefficient for each independent variable represents the effect of that variable on participation relative the participation of other members of the group in question.

(MARIT in Appendix Tables 3-1 and 3-2), which took the value "1" if the respondent was single or divorced and "0" if he or she was married, separated, or widowed./10 Thus these coefficients describe the net participation of single and divorced persons relative that of all others. Finally, the occupational groups were combined to create dichotomous variables (OCC in Appendix Tables 3-1 and 3-2), taking the value of "1" if the respondent was a member of an occupational group characterized by significantly higher participation on most of the core variables and "0" if he or she was not./11

10/ In addition to the pragmatic rationale for combining these groups, note that they divide respondents into those who are likely to be on the marriage market and those who are not, a distinction that seems relevant to patterns of artistic and other leisure participation.

11/ Because of the change in federal occupational categories, these categories were slightly different in 1982 and 1985. In 1982 respondents were coded as "1" if they were in professional and technical, managerial and administrative, sales and clerical occupations, or students; and "0" if they were in craft, service, farm, or transport occupations; if they were operatives or laborers; if they were private household workers, unemployed, or retired; and if they were in the armed forces or their occupations were unknown. In 1985, they were coded "1" if they were in executive, administrative, managerial, professional, technical, sales or administrative support occupations, or if they were students; and "0" if they were in craft, service or farm occupations, if they were operatives or in the armed services, if they were private household workers, unemployed or retired, or if their occupations were unknown. Note that occupational distributions vary considerably by race and ethnicity. Aggregating occupational categories in this way avoids including categories that, for some groups, have only very small numbers of respondents, economizes on computational expense, and simplifies the presentation of the results. It may also obscure some real differences between occupations, especially because the distribution of occupations within each of the two new occupational categories differs by race. For example, Robinson and his colleagues found interesting differen-

The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3-2, which lists the variables that had significantly varying effects on each of the core activities for different groups. Although there were many differences in coefficients across the three subsamples, only those that are statistically significant can be interpreted as real and not just chance results of sampling from larger populations./12 In asking whether determinants of participation in the core activities differed systematically between groups, we looked for significant differences that were present a) for several of the core activities b) in both 1982 and 1985. Although there were interesting differences between groups, which we shall discuss below, no differences met these two criteria. Consequently, we conclude that the sociodemographic predictors of artistic participation (as defined by the core variables) are not systematically different for Blacks, Hispanics, and whites. We discuss those differences that were manifested below.

---

ces among detailed occupational categories that are not captured by this approach. John P. Robinson, Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, Timothy A. Triplett, Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey, Report to National Endowment for the Arts Research Division, October 1985, pp. 261-62. If the focus of this report was on the impact of occupation on participation, these disadvantages would be overwhelming. Given our focus, however, we regard this procedure as warranted. Nonetheless, the reader should be aware that we do not claim that our treatment of occupational effects is definitive.

12/ To determine whether coefficients were significantly different across populations we used a standard rule of thumb: coefficients are significantly different if the difference between them is at least twice the sum of their standard errors of estimate.

Table 3-2: Significant Differences in Models Predicting Responses to Core Participation Questions for Black, Hispanic, and White Subsamples

ACTIVITY	PREDICTOR	
Jazz	WOMEN	Significantly negative for Blacks (1982 and 1985). Not significant for whites in 1982 and significantly positive in 1985.
	MARITAL	Significantly positive for whites but not for Blacks or Hispanics in 1982.
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1982.
Classical Music	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Hispanics in 1982.
	OCCUPATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1985.
Opera	SMSA	Extremely positive for Blacks and Hispanics but not for whites in 1985.
	OCCUPATION	Extremely positive for Hispanics but not for Blacks or whites in 1985.
Musical Theatre	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for Blacks in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for Hispanics than for whites in 1985.
Plays	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for Blacks or Hispanics in 1982.
	SMSA	More significantly positive for Blacks than for whites in 1982.
Ballet	SMSA	Extremely significantly positive for Hispanics but less so for whites and not significant for Blacks in 1982. Extremely significant (positive) for Blacks but not for whites or Hispanics in 1985.

Table 3-2 (continued)

Art Museums	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for Blacks in 1982.
	SMSA	Significantly positive for Blacks but less so for whites and not significant for Hispanics in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Hispanics in 1985.
Perform: Instrument	SMSA	Extremely significantly positive for Hispanics but not for Blacks or whites in 1982.
Perform: Act, sing, dance	SMSA	Extremely positively significant for Hispanics but not for Blacks or whites in 1982 and 1985. (Significantly negative for whites in 1985.)
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1982.
Literature Reading	WOMEN	More significantly positive for whites than for Blacks and Hispanics in 1982 and Blacks in 1985.
	SMSA	More significantly positive for Blacks than for whites in 1985.
	AGE	Significantly negative for Blacks but not for whites in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Blacks in 1982.
	OCCUPATION	More significantly positive for Blacks than for whites in 1982.

Notes: Descriptive statements provided only for differences that are statistically significant. Similar differences that do not reach statistical significance are not noted in this table.

Differences in predictors of participation for whites and Blacks. For both Blacks and whites, educational attainment tended to be the variable that most effectively distinguished participants from nonparticipants for most of the core participation measures. Each of the other independent variables was significant, although less so than education, in predicting most of the participation measures for whites. For Blacks, SMSA residence, income, and, in 1982, occupation, were also significantly related to many core variables. Although they were less likely to be significant for Blacks than for whites (in part because significance is a function of the number of cases and there were many more whites than Blacks among the respondents to the survey), most predictors took the same sign and, in many cases, were of the same order of magnitude for Blacks and whites.

In only a few cases were there significant differences in models predicting core participation activities for the two races. In 1982, most such differences reflected an apparently stronger sexual division of labor in the consumption of the arts among whites than among Blacks. That year, white women were significantly more likely than white men to report having participated in all of the core activities except playing a musical instrument in public and attending jazz concerts./13 By contrast, Black women were signifi-

---

13/ By "more likely," we mean "more likely after controlling for other sociodemographic differences between white men and white women." Unless otherwise specified, all comparative statements in this chapter refer to net differences after the inclusion of sociodemographic controls.

cantly more likely than Black men only to read works of imaginative literature and attend ballet performances. Differences between Blacks and whites in the impact of gender were statistically significant in 1982 with respect to attending jazz concerts, attending musicals, attending plays, visiting art museums and art galleries, and reading literature. In each of the first four cases, white women were more likely to engage in the activity than white men, but Black men were more likely to do so than Black women. Women of both races were more likely to read literature than men, but the differences was significantly greater for whites.

For 1982, these differences were notable and persistent across different kinds of artistic participation. But in 1985, the effects of gender varied less markedly by race, except for jazz attendance and literature reading, for which the gap widened. With respect to attending musicals and plays and visiting art exhibitions, however, Black women joined white women in being more likely than men to participate, and the effects of gender became similar for the two groups. In sum, the pattern for the two years indicates that there may be a more marked sexual division of labor in artistic participation among whites than Blacks; but, except for reading literature and attending jazz concerts, the differences are not large or robust. Nonetheless, the interaction of gender and race deserves further investigation.

For some activities in each year, the positive impact of living in an SMSA was greater for Blacks than for whites.

In 1982, although both Blacks and whites were significantly more likely to attend plays and visit art galleries and museums if they lived in SMSAs, the advantage of SMSA dwellers was significantly greater for Blacks. In 1985, the same was true for reading literature. Also in 1985, SMSA residence was not significantly related to attending operas or ballet performances for whites, but was overwhelmingly so for Blacks. That year, all 20 Blacks who reported going to opera performances, and 32 of 33 who attended ballet performances, lived in SMSAs. These differences between Blacks and whites are notable, but because they were discernible for no activity in both 1982 and 1985, they are difficult to interpret.

In 1982, although single and divorced whites and Blacks were more likely to attend jazz performances than others, their advantage was significantly greater for whites than for Blacks. Although the pattern held in 1985, the difference was not significant.

In 1982, although education and occupation were both very significantly associated with reading works of imaginative literature among both Blacks and whites, the effects of education were significantly stronger for whites and those of occupation were stronger for Blacks. Moreover, whereas age was positively, but not quite significantly, associated with reading for whites, it was negatively and significantly related to reading for Blacks. In 1985, these patterns held but none of the differences was significant, although the

difference for age was nearly so. The pattern suggests, but does not confirm, the hypothesis that there may be increasing interest in reading literature among more recent cohorts of Black Americans that cannot be explained solely by reference to increases in Black educational attainment.

Taken together, the separate models for Blacks and whites suggest that the same sociodemographic characteristics are related to most of the core artistic participation measures in approximately the same way for members of each group. There is some tendency for white women to outparticipate white men more than is the case for Black women and Black men, and a stronger tendency for residence outside an SMSA to depress Black attendance at arts events more than it does that of whites. Few specific differences were significant in both 1982 and 1985, however, leading us to offer these observations as hypotheses for further study rather than as firm conclusions./14

Differences in predictors of participation for whites and Hispanics. As was the case for Blacks and whites, education was by far the strongest predictor of participation in most of the core activities for Hispanics in both

---

14/ Note, too, that none of the differences in the Black/-white comparisons between 1982 and 1985 reflect significant changes in the models for Blacks or for whites in those years. Consequently, where significant interracial differences existed in only one year, their absence in the other reflects their marginal quality and not demonstrable change in the factors influencing participation. We would remind the reader, however, that our conclusions apply only to those kinds of artistic participation about which the core questions asked and only to those sociodemographic factors that were included in our models.

1982 and 1985. As was the case for Blacks, most of the predictors took the same sign and many were of roughly the same magnitude for Hispanics as for whites; but, because of the far smaller number of Hispanic than of non-Hispanic white respondents, fewer were statistically significant.

If anything, patterns of white-Hispanic difference were even less stable between 1982 and 1985 than were patterns of differences between whites and Blacks. SMSA residence was overwhelmingly important for Hispanics with respect to some core activities: All or almost all of the relatively few Hispanic respondents who attended ballet performances or performed on stage (either musical instruments or acting, singing or dancing) in 1982, and who attended opera performances and acted, sang, or danced in 1985 resided in SMSAs. But, oddly enough, SMSA residence had a negative (albeit insignificant) effect on attending ballet performances and public instrumental performance on 1985 and on attending opera in 1982. Thus, except for singing, dancing, and acting on stage, the safest conclusion is that such overwhelming effects of SMSA residence were artifacts of sampling and of the small number of respondents who participated in these activities.

In 1982, educational attainment was significantly related to attending classical music concerts for both whites and Hispanics, but the effects were significantly greater for whites. Similar significant differences were found with respect to jazz attendance and singing, dancing, or acting

on stage, where education had a significant positive influence on white participation but not on that of Hispanics. In 1985, however, none of these differences was significant and, indeed, the impact of education on classical music attendance was slightly greater for Hispanics. That year, the significant positive effects of educational attainment on visiting art museums and galleries were significantly greater for whites than for Hispanics; but the significant positive effects of education on attending musical theatre performances were significantly greater for Hispanics than for whites. Thus although educational attainment played a greater role in white participation in some core activities, the differences were marginal and unstable.

Other differences between whites and Hispanics were even more episodic. The greater tendency of single and divorced persons to attend jazz performances was significantly more marked for whites than Hispanics in 1982, but, although the pattern persisted, the difference was not significant in 1985. White women, but not Hispanic women, were significantly more likely than men to attend plays in 1982, and the intergroup difference was significant. Moreover, in 1982, although both white and Hispanic women were more likely to report reading literature than comparable men, the difference between women and men was significantly greater for whites. In 1985, neither these differences nor any other difference in gender effects was significant, although the pattern persisted. In 1985, the advantage of white-collar

persons in participation was significantly greater for whites with respect to attending classical music performances but much greater for Hispanics with respect to opera attendance; but neither of these effects were evident in 1982. Given these relatively few, relatively weak, and very inconsistent results, we can only conclude that the factors accounting for participation in the core activities were similar for whites and Hispanics.

Differences in predictors of participation for Blacks and Hispanics. Strictly speaking, there were no statistically significant differences in the models predicting participation in the core activities for Blacks and Hispanics. In those cases, mentioned above, where all or nearly all of those participating lived in SMSAs, the computer program could not compute significance tests, but the differences were notable. But as we have seen, such cases appear to reflect small numbers of participants and sampling conditions rather than persistent differences over time.

Differences in predictors of participation for each group between 1982 and 1985. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the brief time between the two surveys, no statistically significant differences in predictors for Blacks and Hispanics were observed. For whites, residence in an SMSA had a significantly stronger positive impact on visiting art galleries and museums, and a significantly stronger negative impact on public instrumental performance in 1985 than in 1982. The positive impact of educational attainment on

reading imaginative literature was slightly, but significantly, weaker in 1985 than in 1982. Given the large size of the white subsample and the large number of coefficients, we place little stock in these differences.

Summary. It was important to test whether the models for Blacks, Hispanics and whites indicated that the factors influencing participation for these groups differed. If they had, such evidence might have suggested, first, that the social meaning of participation differed, on average, for members of these groups and, second, that public policies or sociodemographic change would influence Black, Hispanic, and white participation in systematically different ways. Moreover, if the differences were substantial, they might lead us to question our interpretations of the aggregated models described in the first part of this chapter.

The findings of these analyses provide no compelling evidence of systematic differences in factors leading Blacks, Hispanics, and whites to participate in the core activities about which the SPPAs asked. Significant differences were few, usually small in magnitude, and rarely persisted from one year to the other. It is possible that more differences would have been found had the selection of activities about which respondents were asked been broader. Note, however, that the variation present among the different core activities was sufficient to permit us to note systematic patterns in racial differences in rates of participation, whereas no such systematic differences were observed

with respect to the predictors of participation. It is also possible that a different set of predictor variables might have revealed significant differences not noted here. It is not obvious to us, however, what such additional predictors might be. Finally, were the Black and Hispanic sample sizes larger, it is likely that more differences would have emerged as statistically significant. We believe there are important reasons to include more Black and Hispanic (and Asian and Native American) respondents in the SPPA. But we regard the Black and Hispanic sample sizes as adequate for this section's purpose, i.e. detecting substantively meaningful differences in models predicting core participation items. In short, the analyses presented in this section convince us that the sociodemographic characteristics accounting for most kinds of artistic participation are basically similar for Black, Hispanic, and white Americans. Nonetheless, we shall return to this issue in chapter 5, when we construct more detailed models predicting several additional dimensions of artistic participation.

Chapter 4: Racial/Ethnic Differences in Unsated Demand for Participation

In chapter 2, we noted persistent differences in rates at which Asian, Black, Hispanic, and white Americans participate in the core activities about which the SPPAs asked all respondents. In chapter 3, we asked to what extent these differences could be accounted for by sociodemographic aspects with respect to which Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and whites also differ. In this chapter, we focus on the extent to which such differences reflect intergroup differences in demand for the arts as opposed to differential exposure to barriers to participation. We consider this question with respect to the seven core activities that involve attendance at art events./1

Approximately one quarter of the 1982 respondents and one sixth of the 1985 sample were shown a card listing the activities and told: "Few people can do everything they would like to do. But if you could do any of the things listed on this card as often as you wanted, which ones would you do more often than you have during the last 12 months?" Those respondents who said they would like to have done a given activity more than they had in the past year were then asked to indicate which of several reasons were responsible for the fact that they had not participated more.

1/ Questions on unsated demand for and barriers preventing the other three core activities (two kinds of public performance and reading imaginative literature) were not included in the SPPA.

In the next section, we consider the extent to which demand for additional participation varied by race and ethnicity. In the section after that, we focus on the reasons respondents offered for participating less than they would have liked.

Demand for Greater Participation

Members of a group may participate in a given activity at a lower rate than members of another group for either of two reasons. They may do so because they enjoy or otherwise value the activity less. Or they may want to engage in the activity as much as do members of the other group, but face obstacles to participation that the others do not.

These two explanations have very different implications for public policy. If low participation results not from low demand but from differential exposure to barriers of different groups, policy might equalize participation by eliminating the barriers. If low participation results not from barriers but from low demand, policies aimed at eliminating inequality must serve to increase demand and not simply to level barriers.

We are not entirely sanguine about interpreting people's responses to questions about their desire for increased participation, for we are not sure what people mean when they say they "want" to attend arts events more than they do. Some people may deeply desire to attend more, but be unable to do so for well defined reasons. Others may wish to attend more, but lack the willingness to pay the costs in

foregone opportunities to do other things they value even more highly. Still others may mean that they wish they were the kind of person who liked the arts more than they do. We do not believe that everyone who reported wanting to participate in an activity more cared passionately about doing so. As long as the different meanings of "want" were not distributed by race and ethnicity in dramatically different ways, however, responses to this question may provide clues as to the extent that intergroup variation in attendance represents differences in demand or differences in opportunity. Nonetheless, without knowing more than we do about the subjective meaning of these responses, we are reluctant to regard them as any more than clues.

Responses to the "want more" question are reported in Table 4-1 for each activity and for Blacks, Hispanics, whites and (in 1985) Asians. We assume that "wanting to do more" means something different for a person who already participates than it does for someone who does not. Consequently, we report results separately for attenders (respondents who engaged in the activity at least once during the previous 12 months) and nonattenders. Consistent with our focus on rates of participation (rather than levels of participation), we look most closely at the latter.

Findings. It has been suggested that the arts are addictive. That is, whereas demand for most goods precedes and is sated by consumption, consumption of the arts is said

TABLE 4-1: Percentage of Attenders and Nonattenders Wanting to Do Each Activity More Than They Had in the Previous 12 Months, by Race/Ethnicity

	jazz		classical		opera		musical	
Attenders	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Whites	53.77 394	59.89 168	53.15 568	46.56 279	44.50 111	40.41 48	69.77 882	64.69 380
Blacks	67.74 80	50.12 42	42.79 31	41.62 17	26.95 4	25.18 9	50.03 44	56.85 30
Hispanics	51.41 28	42.23 10	61.89 17	44.99 8	24.87 4	NA 0	68.91 34	45.24 11
Asians		NA 0		42.41 4		0.00 2		30.61 4
Non-attenders	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Whites	13.34 3995	14.60 1643	14.28 3824	13.36 1534	7.17 4278	8.50 1762	27.33 3510	24.82 1430
Blacks	24.08 457	22.30 245	10.34 506	7.82 269	4.88 531	3.42 278	16.35 493	14.87 256
Hispanics	14.13 273	19.28 138	12.65 284	5.61 140	4.82 297	4.80 148	16.24 267	10.29 137
Asians		6.77 47		5.29 43		1.98 45		14.01 42

Table 4-1 (con.)

	plays		ballet		art	
Attenders	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Whites	62.42	59.95	54.29	55.09	57.18	57.91
	575	245	182	80	1057	475
Blacks	55.38	48.06	31.83	44.33	50.48	57.26
	27	23	5	11	49	33
Hispanics	57.45	20.44	57.92	65.01	78.86	63.59
	18	4	9	3	52	28
Asians		NA		0.00		43.23
		0		2		6
Non-attenders	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Whites	22.48	22.10	11.01	11.42	24.40	24.07
	3816	1565	4211	1733	3334	1337
Blacks	9.45	8.31	6.20	5.74	17.80	20.20
	510	263	532	276	488	254
Hispanics	9.54	8.43	7.26	10.75	19.25	17.66
	283	144	292	145	249	120
Asians		6.43		6.04		11.60
		47		45		41

Percentages are weighted, Ns are unweighted.

to beget demand for more./2 If this is the case, it explains what John Robinson, in a report on the 1982 SPPA data, has called the "more-more principle": the more activities in which respondents participate, the more likely they are to participate in still others./3

Our findings on unsated demand for the core attendance activities are consistent with Robinson's "more-more" dictum and with the addiction model of arts consumption. With only four exceptions (all cases in which only two or fewer respondents participated in the given activity), in the case of every activity and every racial/ethnic group, attenders were more than twice as likely (and in most cases three or four times as likely) to want to participate more than were nonattenders. For example, in 1982, 54 percent of white jazz attenders, but just 14 percent of white nonattenders, reported wanting to attend jazz concerts more. That year, 43 percent of Blacks who attended classical music concerts wanted to attend more compared to just 10 percent of Black nonattenders. Almost 80 percent of Hispanics who visited art museums or galleries, but less than 20 percent of those who did not, wanted to do more of that activity.

2/ See Roger A. McCain, "Reflections on the cultivation of taste," Journal of Cultural Economics 3, 1 (1979), pp. 30-52; and "Game Theory and Cultivation of Taste," Journal of Cultural Economics 10, 1 (1986), pp. 1-16.

3/ John Robinson, Public Participation in the Arts: A Project Summary (College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Survey Research Center, 1985, pp. 2-3ff.

The more-more principle also applied at the group level among nonattenders. That is, for each activity, except for Asian-Americans, nonattending members of the racial or ethnic group that attended most were also more likely than members of other groups to want to attend. For example, more than 20 percent of Blacks who did not attend jazz concerts wanted to in both survey years. By contrast, fewer than 15 percent of nonattending whites wished to attend. With respect to the other activities, which whites were more likely to attend, white nonattenders were more likely than other nonattenders to report wanting to participate.

For activities, the differences were small. For example, in 1982, 14 percent of whites who had not attended classical music concerts wanted to do so, compared to 10 percent of such Blacks and 13 percent of Hispanic nonattenders. In other cases, the differences were more sizable. In 1982, 22 percent of nonattending whites, but fewer than 10 percent of nonattending Blacks and Hispanics wished to go to stage theatre performances.

Asian-Americans were the exception to the more-more principle. Although they participated in most activities at rates either higher or only slightly lower than those of white Americans, the percentages reporting a desire to attend each activity more were lower than those for all or most other groups. Whatever the reason, the gap between self-reported aspiration and actual participation was smaller for Asian respondents than for members of other groups.

The tendency of nonattenders from groups with relatively high rates of attendance to want to attend more than those from groups with lower attendance rates can be interpreted in either of two ways. To the extent that members of these groups tend to socialize disproportionately with others from those groups, nonattenders in groups with high attendance rates may come into more frequent contact with attenders than members of other groups. On the one hand, this contact may engender a greater desire to try the activity in question. On the other, it may engender guilt about non-participation, and consequently inflate what survey analysts refer to as "social-desirability bias" in their responses. The latter possibility is one more reason to interpret these data with caution.

How would rates of participation change if everyone did what he or she wanted? Let us take the responses at face value and treat them as indicators of genuine unsated demand for the activities about which respondents were asked. If each non-attender who said that he or she wanted to participate was to do so, how would differences in participation by race and ethnicity be affected?

The answers are presented in Table 4-2. For each activity, each survey year, and each racial/ethnic group, data are presented on the percentage reporting participation in the prior year; the percentage who did not participate but reported they wanted to; and the total "potential audience" comprising both groups.

Table 4-2: Real Attendance Rates, Potential Increments, and Total Potential Attendance by Race and Ethnicity

Jazz

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	9.13	15.64	8.27	9.48	13.08	6.55	7.81
Increment	12.30	20.31	12.13	13.22	19.38	18.02	6.24
Potential	21.43	35.95	20.40	22.70	32.46	24.57	14.05

Classical

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	14.42	6.67	7.87	14.31	6.39	6.77	16.50
Increment	12.22	9.65	11.65	11.45	7.32	5.23	4.42
Potential	26.64	16.32	19.52	25.76	13.71	12.00	20.92

Opera

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	3.33	1.36	2.52	2.97	1.43	0.78	4.58
Increment	6.93	4.81	4.70	8.25	3.37	4.76	1.89
Potential	10.26	6.17	7.22	11.22	4.80	5.54	5.47

Musical

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	20.67	10.10	10.96	18.60	8.45	9.52	13.89
Increment	21.68	14.70	14.46	20.20	13.61	9.31	12.06
Potential	42.35	24.80	25.42	38.80	22.06	18.53	25.95

Plays

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	13.44	5.82	5.47	13.10	6.09	6.41	8.87
Increment	19.46	8.90	9.02	19.20	7.80	7.89	5.86
Potential	32.90	14.72	14.49	32.30	13.89	14.30	14.73

Ballet

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	4.64	1.78	4.54	4.72	2.14	3.21	6.22
Increment	10.50	6.09	6.93	10.88	5.62	10.40	5.66
Potential	15.14	7.87	11.47	15.60	7.76	13.61	11.88

Art

	1982			1985			
	W	B	H	W	B	H	A
Base	23.94	12.47	16.22	24.14	10.71	18.18	26.02
Increment	18.56	15.58	16.12	18.26	18.04	14.45	8.58
Potential	42.50	28.05	32.34	42.40	28.75	32.63	34.60

Base rates from Table 2-1. Increment=percentage of non-attenders who reported wanting to participate times complement of base.

The first thing to note is that potential participation rates, defined in this way, are much greater than the actual participation rates for all groups but Asian-Americans. Indeed, except for white attendance (in 1982 and 1985) and Hispanic attendance (in 1985) at classical music concerts and white and Hispanic visits to art museums and galleries (in both years), potential rates are at least twice the actual rates of attendance. In many cases, the differences are much greater than that. In other words, fewer people participated in these activities than did not but said they would like to do so.

Because nonattending members of groups with high participation rates are more likely to report wanting to attend than are nonattending members of other groups, the first effect of everyone doing what he or she reports wanting to would be to widen the absolute intergroup percentage difference in participation rates. In the case of jazz, the absolute difference between Black participation rates and those of whites and Hispanics would double. In the case of the other six activities. the absolute difference between white rates and those of Blacks and Hispanics would increase. (Again, Asian-Americans are the exceptions to the rule. Although their real participation rates in classical music, opera, ballet, and art-exhibit attendance were higher than those for other groups, their potential participation rates were actually lower than those of whites for all of these and of Hispanics for opera attendance.) In other words, if

everyone did what they said they wanted to do, the absolute gap in participation rates between whites and everyone else would become wider. (The exceptional activity is jazz, for which the gap between Blacks and everyone else would widen.)

In chapter 2, we focused not on absolute differences in rates but on the ratio of the white rate to rates for other groups. In other words, we asked how much more likely whites were than Blacks or Hispanics to participate in these activities. If we put the question this way, our results are mixed. For most activities -- and in 1982 for all activities but jazz and ballet -- the ratios of white to other potential rates are lower than the ratios of white to other real attendance rates. For example, whites were more than twice as likely as Blacks to attend musicals in 1982. If everyone who wanted had attended, they would have been only 1.71 times as likely. Similarly, whites were nearly 50 percent more likely to visit art galleries or museums than Hispanic Americans in 1982. If everyone who wanted had attended, their advantage would have declined to approximately 30 percent.

With respect to several activities, however, ratios between white and other groups' potential participation rates are even higher than for real participation rates. This is true of the White/Black ratios for opera attendance and theatre-going in 1985 and of white/Hispanic ratios for opera and ballet attendance in 1982 and for classical music, musical theatre, and straight theatre attendance in 1985. For

example, in 1985 white Americans were 2.04 times as likely as Hispanic Americans to report theatre attendance; whereas they were 2.26 times as likely to appear in the "potential" audience for stage plays.

These results indicate that differences in participation in core activities do not result from barriers that disproportionately affect the ability of members of different groups from satisfying perceived demand. Instead they seem to reflect differences in the extent to which members of different racial and ethnic groups believe that they want to attend such arts events. For each of the seven activities about which they were asked (and with the notable exception of Asian Americans), nonattenders of the groups whose members already participated at the highest rates were more likely than others to want to become participants. If everyone who said he or she wanted to attend had done so, the absolute gaps in attendance would have been greater. For most activities, the ratios in participation rates between the highest-attending group and other groups would have declined, but for some they would have increased.

If Black and Hispanic nonattenders had wanted to participate more than white nonattenders, this would have constituted strong evidence that intergroup differences reflected barriers to minority attendance and not differences in demand. Clearly these data do not point in that direction. It would be simplistic, however, to take these results as

strong evidence that intergroup differences do not reflect differences in opportunity, for three reasons.

First, the most effective barriers to participation may be those that influence demand, not those that influence the ability of persons to satisfy demand they already have. If, as the addiction theory mentioned at the beginning of this section suggests, taste for the arts is acquired through participation in the arts, then any barriers that prevent persons from participating in the arts are likely to be reflected in lower demand from the persons excluded./4

Second, respondents to the SPPA "want-more" questions may have responded on the basis of pre-conscious understandings about the costs associated with getting more of what they wanted. If there are higher costs to participation for minorities than for whites, differences in demand may reflect these costs.

Third, it is possible, for the reasons discussed above, that social-desirability bias inflated the "want-more" responses of whites relative those of Blacks and Hispanics for those activities in which white Americans have the highest rates of participation.

These are all hypotheses that should lead us to avoid hasty conclusions on the basis of these findings, but should

---

4/ Note that there is nothing circular about this argument. In the case of most other goods, demand is greater among those with less. If I do not have a washing machine, I am likely to want one. Once I have one, I will not need another until the one I have breaks down. Similarly, my demand for breakfast is higher before rather than after I have eaten. The arts may be different.

not lead us to dismiss them either. The results of these analyses indicate that it would be simple-minded to think about intergroup differences in arts attendance in the same way we think about intergroup differences in the consumption of education. In the case of education, we have much evidence that demand is similar among racial and ethnic groups, with everyone viewing education as a good thing that helps people get ahead./5 In the case of the arts, the evidence presented here indicates that attendance at the live events about which people were asked is not desired equally by members of all groups. The evidence indicates that demand varies by group and that if there are barriers, they work in large part by influencing demand for live attendance.

Why People Who Want to Do Not Attend

Respondents who said that they wanted to participate in one of the seven core attendance questions were given a list of possible reasons for not attending more than they did and were asked to check all those that applied. The reasons among which respondents could choose included: "Tickets sold out"; "cost"; "Not available"; "Feel uncomfortable"; "Don't have anyone to go with"; "Babysitter problems/Must care for children"; "Problem related to a handicap"; "Problem related to age/health"; "Too far to go"; "Transportation/Traffic/-Parking problems"; "Crime or fear of crime"; "Poor quality/-

---

5/ See, e.g., David Featherman and Robert Hauser, "Changes in Socioeconomic Stratification of the Races, 1962-1973," American Journal of Sociology 82 (1976), pp. 621-51.

Not very good, etc."; "Prefer to watch TV;" "Don't have time"; "Procrastination/Lack of Motivation"; and "Other."/6 To simplify the analyses we coded together "problem related to a handicap" and "problem related to age/health." Similarly, we coded together "Procrastination/Lack of motivation" and "Prefer to watch TV" because we regarded each of these as indicating exceptionally low levels of demand, so low as to suggest some inconsistency with the respondent's professed desire to attend more.

We present the results in two forms. Appendix Tables 4-1 through 4-7 list, for Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites for 1982 and 1985, the weighted percentage of "want-more" attenders and "want-more" nonattenders in each group in each year giving each reason, along with the unweighted numbers of respondents upon which results for each group are based./7 Table 4-3 summarizes the information for nonattenders who reported wanting to attend -- the group of most immediate interest here -- by listing for whites, Blacks, and Hispanics in each year the three reasons given by the largest numbers of respondents and the percentages (of the nonattenders who wished to attend) giving each response. (In

---

6/ The 1982 SPPA data set contained several precoded "Other" responses, none of which was chosen by even 10 percent of the would-be attenders.

7/ Results for any group are not reported when the base number of respondents -- those "wanting more" of something -- is smaller than 10. Results for a given reason are not reported when fewer than 10 percent of any group in either year marked that reason as applicable.

Table 4-3: Leading Reasons Given for Non-Attendance by Non-Attenders Who Wished to Attend

Jazz, 1982
W Time (41), Cost (26), Not Available (22)
B Cost (45), Time (24), Transportation (14)
H Cost (40), Time (37), Not Available (14)

Jazz, 1985
W Time (45), Cost (29), Not Available (23)
B Time (41), Cost (39), Not Available (13)
H Cost (55), Lack Motivation (31), Time (31), Child Care (21)

Classical, 1982
W Time (39), Cost (28), Not Available (23)
B Cost (44), Time (35), Transportation (21)
H Cost (48), Time (33), Too Far to Go (20)

Classical, 1985
W Time (35), Cost (30), Too Far to Go (25), Not Available (24)
B Time (48), Cost (24), Transportation (17)
H Insufficient Number of Respondents

Opera, 1982
W Cost (35), Time (30), Not Available (26)
B Cost (39), Time (30), Too Far to Go (12)
H Cost (68), Too Far to Go (36), Time (15)

Opera, 1985
W Cost (37), Time (33), Too Far to Go (26)
B Time (61), Transportation (30), Too Far to Go (14)
H Insufficient Number of Respondents

Musical Theatre, 1982
W Time (37), Cost (31), Not Available (21)
B Cost (47), Time (29), Lack Motivation (12)
H Cost (37), Time (33), Too Far to Go (29)

Musical Theatre, 1985
W Time (34), Cost (32), Too Far to Go (19)
B Cost (43), Time (26), Too Far to Go (15)
H Cost (53), Time (37), Child Care (17)

Table 4-3 (con.)

Plays, 1982
W Time (39), Cost (31), Too Far to Go (15)
B Cost (24), Not Available (20), Time (15)
H Cost (44), Time (41), Lack Motivation (12)

Plays, 1985
W Time (39), Cost (25), Not Available (21)
B Time (39), Cost (38), Transportation (14)
H Cost (60), Time (51), Lack Motivation (25)

Ballet, 1982
W Time (32), Cost (29), Not Available (27)
B Cost (43), Time (33), Not Available (14)
H Cost (46), Time (26), Too Far to Go (20)

Ballet, 1985
W Time (35), Cost (33), Too Far to Go (22)
B Time (51), Cost (37), Fear of Crime (12)
H Cost (44), Time (28), Too Far to Go (16)

Art Museums and Galleries, 1982
W Time (40), Not Available (25), Too Far to Go (20)
B Time (31), Cost (23), Lack Motivation (18)
H Time (47), Child Care (15), Transportation (13)

Art Museums and Galleries, 1985
W Time (39), Not Available (24), Too Far to Go (21)
B Time (53), Transportation (19), Cost (17)
H Time (74), Lack Motivation (34), Cost (30)

Note: Figures in parentheses are weighted percentages of those non-attending respondents who wanted to attend who reported a given reason for not attending. Data summarized from Appendix Tables 4-1 through 4-7.

the two cases in which more than 20 percent of such respondents marked a fourth reason, that one is reported as well.)

These findings are suggestive at best. The results for Black and Hispanic Americans are based on very small numbers of respondents because these questions were asked during only some of the survey months and because relatively few nonattenders wished to become attenders./8 Moreover, we find responses to these questions difficult to interpret. We can be reasonably certain that some of the reasons provided were hastily selected excuses offered under duress by respondents who may have expressed a casual wish to do something they had not done. We are certain that others reflect real barriers to attendance. There is no obvious way to tell the two apart. For example, some people who said they did not attend stage plays because they were given at sites too far away may have made no effort to find out whether plays were presented nearby. Others may have been suburbanites who think nothing of going downtown to visit a museum, but value stage plays less than other forms of recreation. Still others may live in rural areas of prairie states where the nearest theatre is three hours away. Some respondents who gave "cost" or "don't have enough time" as reasons may be destitute or work 70 hour weeks to support large families: that is, they may be people with little or no discret-

---

8/ In 1982, none of the percentages for Hispanic Americans is based on more than 48 respondents and in 1985, none is based on more than 21. Ns for Black Americans ranged from 23 (for opera) to 113 (for jazz performances) in 1982; and from 10 (opera) to 59 (jazz) in 1985.

ionary money or time. Others may have more discretionary income or time, but choose to spend it on other things. For the latter, "cost" or "time" responses tell us not just about barriers but about the value that respondents place on the arts relative other uses of their time and money. Absent information on the value that respondents place on attendance at the core activities, or questions that permit us to make inferences about how they value the arts, responses to the barrier questions are virtually uninterpretable.

Nonetheless, if we assume that the underlying valuation of arts attendance is the same for all three groups and if we remember to treat the data as merely suggestive, the results are interesting./9 For members of all groups, cost

---

9/ Can we assume that underlying valuations of arts attendance are the same for all three groups? The answer to this question is not obvious. The most cautious assumption is that the underlying distributions of value that Black, Hispanic and white respondents place on the activities in which they report wanting to take part are basically similar. On the one hand, we have seen in chapter 3 that after controlling for measures of educational and economic resources (which can be interpreted as measures of economic barriers to participation), Black Americans are more likely to attend jazz performances and less likely to attend the other activities than white Americans, whereas Hispanic Americans attend most activities at levels not significantly different from those of white Americans. A rough inference from these results would be that the average Black American values jazz more highly and the other activities less highly than the average white American, and that white and Hispanic Americans value them to more or less the same degree. But the figures in this section are based not on average Black, Hispanic, or white respondents but on those who did not attend but said that they wanted to do so. Such persons seem likely to value the arts more than their peers who neither participated nor wish to participate; and, if the speculations about social-desirability bias set out earlier in this chapter are correct, this tendency may be greater for Blacks and Hispanics than for whites. Consistent with this hypothesis, white respondents tended to give such reasons as procrastin-

and lack of time were the most important reasons given for nonparticipation. With respect to most activities, white respondents were more likely to give time as a reason than cost, and Hispanic respondents were more like to cite cost than time. In 1982, Black respondents were somewhat more likely to mention cost than time for most activities, whereas in 1985 they were somewhat more likely to cite time than cost. Lack of availability was frequently cited by whites and a similar reason, that events were too far away, was often mentioned by Hispanics. Black respondents frequently mentioned these and also cited transportation problems as impediments to attendance more than whites and, for most activities, more than Hispanics. For most activities, Hispanics were more likely than Blacks or whites to cite child care problems as reasons for not attending. Fear of crime, handicap or health problems, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, or performance time did not loom large as reasons for many respondents in any group.

In other words, whites tended to cite reasons indicative of an inadequate supply of activities more than members of other groups. By contrast, Blacks and Hispanics were more likely than whites to mention problems like cost, transportation, and child care that are associated with insufficient financial resources. It follows from this that

---

ation, a lack of motivation, or a preference for watching television (each of which we regard as evidence of a relatively low valuation of the activity in question) more frequently than Blacks or Hispanics. However, the differences are small and inconsistent.

programs aimed at improving geographic access to the arts may disproportionately aid white Americans, whereas programs focused on economic barriers to access may be more likely to assist Blacks and Hispanics.

At the same time, however, most of these differences were either relatively weak or somewhat inconsistent from activity to activity or year to year. Overall, the reasons given by Blacks, Hispanics and whites who did not attend the core activities, but would like to do so, were rather similar, and focused on cost, time, and availability.

Conclusions

Demand for participation in the seven core attendance activities appears to be cultivated by attendance. People who already attend are much more likely to want to attend more than are people who do not. Thus although there is much apparent unsated demand for these activities, most of it comes from among attenders rather than nonattenders. Because, with the exception of jazz performances, whites are more likely to attend than are Blacks or Hispanics, unsated demand appears to be greater among whites than among members of these groups.

If we look only at nonattenders, members of groups with higher attendance rates (Blacks for jazz performance, whites for the other attendance activities) are more likely than others to say that they want to attend. If we take professed desire for attendance at face value, then if all barriers to attendance were removed, the absolute differences

in percentage participation rates between the groups that participate most and those that participate least would increase. Because intergroup differences in desired participation among nonattenders are less, in most but not all cases, than are intergroup differences in actual participation, the ratios of white attendance to Black and Hispanic attendance, respectively, would decline somewhat for most, but not all, activities if everyone did what they said they wanted to do.

Data on people's reasons for not attending are difficult to interpret and the numbers of Black and Hispanic respondents are small. This weak evidence suggests that white, Black, and Hispanic would-be attenders are all deterred most frequently by cost, lack of time, and limited availability. At the same time, whites are somewhat more likely to mention reasons related to limited availability than are members of other groups, whereas Black and Hispanic respondents are more likely to mention reasons related to poverty. Because, except for jazz, white nonattenders were more likely to report wanting to attend the events about which they were asked than were Black or Hispanic nonattenders, and because most intergroup differences were relatively small or inconsistent, the evidence does not indicate that eliminating income-related barriers would quickly or markedly erode intergroup differences in participation.

These findings may seem inconsistent with some of the results presented in earlier chapters. For example, we noted earlier that the differences in rates of participation

between whites, on the one hand, and Hispanics and Blacks, on the other, were less for watching the arts on television than for live attendance. This led us to suggest that Blacks and Hispanics might be deterred from live attendance at the core activities (other than jazz) by something other than taste. Yet the "want-more" questions failed to uncover greater unsated demand for live attendance (except for jazz) among these groups than among white Americans.

One reason for this may be that live attendance at an arts event requires a greater degree of commitment than watching a similar event on television. A second may be that demand for live attendance is influenced more by attributes of the attendance experience than by attributes of an artistic program itself. A third is that persons may consciously or unconsciously take account of barriers that raise their cost of attendance in responding to questions about unsated demand. The SPPA data do not permit us to determine which, if any, of these explanations is correct.

Our results may also seem at odds with the logistic regression analyses that showed that the difference in participation rates between Hispanic Americans and (non-Hispanic) white Americans were reduced to insignificance when differences among groups in sociodemographic factors were taken into account. If this was the case, would we not expect to see high levels of unsated demand, explained by economic barriers, among Hispanic Americans?

Not necessarily. Our regression analyses indicated only that Hispanic Americans were similar in their participation in the core activities to white Americans with similar sociodemographic characteristics. It seems likely, on the basis of the data we have analyzed, that sociodemographic barriers work not just by making it more difficult for people who want to participate to do so, but also by influencing the extent to which people want to participate.

The reader will have noticed that our conclusions in this chapter have been general and laced with qualifications. The reason for this is that we have relatively little faith in the utility of the SPPA questions on the extent of and reasons for unsated demand for understanding intergroup differences in participation. Some of our reservations have to do with the small number of Black, Hispanic, and Asian respondents upon which our analyses, especially of reasons for nonattendance, are based. We hope that future SPPAs will oversample Black, Hispanic, Asian and Native American respondents so that more detailed and confident analysis will be possible.

Most of our reservations, however, have to do with the questions themselves, which seem to us to embody an unsophisticated view of human motivation. Although responses to these questions may be applicable to short-term marketing issues, we suspect that they tell us little about the complex processes that culminate in demand for attendance at live arts events or about the long-term potential for inc-

reases in participation in core attendance activities. To some extent, surveys are intrinsically blunt instruments for addressing questions of motivation./10 Scholars in such areas as environmental policy studies, however, have recently made advances in survey methodology that are relevant to the assessment of latent demand for the arts. Drafters of subsequent editions of the SPPA might benefit by taking such developments into account./11

10/ For a compelling example of the ability of the clinical method to tap dimensions of motivation that seem likely to elude survey approaches, see Robert Coles, "The Art Museum and the Pressures of Society," Artnews 74 (1975), pp. 24-33.

11/ See, especially, Robert Cameron Mitchell and Richard T. Carson, Using Surveys to Value Public Goods: The Contingent Valuation Method (Baltimore: Resources for the Future/Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

Chapter 5: Evidence on Racial and Ethnic Differences in Participation from the November/December 1982 Subsample

Most of the analyses reported in chapters 2 and 3 drew on data from all respondents to the 1982 and 1985 SPPAs. Because there were so many respondents, these analyses were statistically powerful, permitting confident generalization.

At the same time, because most of the SPPA questions were asked only in certain months, reliance on the full data sets prevented us from exploring relationships among answers to the full range of questions the surveys included. In this chapter, we take advantage of the survey's breadth by using data collected in November and December 1982. In these months alone, respondents were asked all of the questions that appeared on the SPPA survey.

There are two advantages to focussing on this subsample. First, we can go beyond the core items to examine participation in a broader range of artistic activities. We have already noted that intergroup differences vary for different kinds of arts participation. In this chapter we investigate such differences more thoroughly.

Second, the November/December 1982 subsample permits us to explore the combined effects on participation of a broader range of explanatory variables by including them in the same models. In addition to the sociodemographic factors investigated in chapter 3, in this chapter we consider the influence on participation of youthful experience, musical taste, and viewing arts programs on television.

These advantages bear a cost: the decline of statistical power associated with a reduction in the number of respondents included in the sample from more than 15,000 to 2255. In particular, some of the following results are based on small numbers of Black or Hispanic respondents. Thus the effects of race or ethnicity must be larger than in analyses reported in earlier chapters if they are to reach statistical significance. Nonetheless, the sample size is sufficient to reveal intergroup differences that are substantively important.

The basic November/December sample contained data on 2255 respondents, of whom 1908 were white, 230 were Black, and 117 were of Hispanic origin./1 (Respondents classified as "Other" were not included in these analyses.) Table 5-1 compares probabilities of participation by race for November and December in the ten core activities to those for the 1982 sample as a whole. The Hispanic Americans included in the November/December sample were much less likely to report attending classical music concerts, much more likely to report acting, singing or dancing on stage, and somewhat more likely to report reading imaginative literature than the Hispanic sample for the year as a whole. Black respondents for November/December were somewhat less likely to report

1/ Non-Hispanic respondents whose race was coded as "other" (including Asian-Americans, Native Americans, and those not classifiable) were removed from the sample. (There were too few of these respondents for most of our purposes and, in any case, the heterogeneity of the category would have made any results uninterpretable.) A few respondents for whom data on key variables were missing were likewise eliminated.

Table 5-1: Percentage Participating in Core and Other Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity, November/December and Full 1982 Samples

	Attend jazz concert		Attend classical conc.		Attend opera performance		Attend musical		Attend play	
	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.
WHITE	9.1	8.8	14.4	11.7	3.3	1.5	20.7	19.7	13.4	11.6
BLACK	15.6	16.9	6.7	5.0	1.4	0.5	10.1	8.6	5.8	4.9
HISPANIC	8.2	9.0	7.9	2.2	2.5	0.8	11.0	11.8	5.5	3.9

	Attend ballet		Visit art exhibit		Perform on musical instrument		Perform: act/sing/dance		Read fiction	
	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.	Full	N.D.
WHITE	4.6	3.8	23.9	23.3	4.0	3.8	4.7	4.2	60.2	60.1
BLACK	1.8	0.7	12.5	9.8	3.4	3.7	4.9	4.4	42.4	38.4
HISPANIC	4.5	2.8	16.2	15.9	3.1	4.6	2.9	7.8	36.5	42.5

Note: Weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during twelve months preceding survey.

having visited art exhibits or having read imaginative literature than their counterparts during the rest of the year. Attendance rates at classical music concerts, opera performances, plays, ballet performances, and art exhibits were lower for all groups in November/December than in all of 1982. For the most part, however, differences in participation between Blacks, whites, and Hispanics are similar for the full and for the November/December samples.

We begin this chapter by introducing the variables included in the analyses that follow and describing unadjusted differences in group means between white, Black, and Hispanic respondents. Next, we use the statistical technique of multiple regression analysis to assess the extent to which intergroup differences in participation are attributable to variation among groups in sociodemographic status, youthful experience, and two rough proxy measures of taste. Then we ask whether the same factors predict participation in the arts for Black, Hispanic, and white respondents. Finally, we investigate whether the effects on participation of race or ethnicity differ for men and women, or for respondents of varying ages and levels of formal educational attainment.

Measures

The SPPA gathered many measures of artistic socialization and current participation. In chapter 3, we focussed exclusively on the core participation items. Because this chapter explores the full range of data available, economy of

presentation dictates that we use scales -- omnibus measures comprising several similar items in a single variable.

As we saw in chapters 2 and 3, different kinds of participation are associated with race and ethnicity in different ways. To develop scales of arts participation, we applied a statistical method called factor analysis to the core participation and other participation variables described in chapter 2.

Factor analysis permits one to detect families of variables that are strongly associated with one another. In the case of the participation measures, it revealed the existence of four such clusters. (See Appendix Table 5-1.)

Performing Arts Attendance: The first six core participation measures, all involving attendance at performing-arts presentations, loaded together on a single factor. These included (in descending order of the strength of the relationship of each to the others) attending plays, attending ballet, attending musical theatre, attending classical music performances, attending opera, and attending jazz performances. The resulting variable is an additive scale of these activities, ranging from 0 to 6.

Exhibit Visiting: The core activity, visiting an art gallery or museum, combined with items on the "other participation" list to form a second factor. The first four activities in this scale -- in descending order, visiting historic monuments, visiting art or craft

fairs, visiting science or history museums, and visiting art exhibits -- all involved attendance at exhibitions. The fifth and sixth items, reading novels and other imaginative literature and doing needlecrafts, were anomalous, having in common only that they do not involve the performing arts. This additive scale ranges from 0 to 6.

Performing-Arts Activities. A third factor consists of four activities, two from the core list and two from the "other participation" items, each of which involves producing, rather than consuming, performing-arts events. In descending order these activities, summed to an additive scale ranging from 0 to 4, are acting, singing or dancing on stage, public performance of a musical instrument, working on a theatrical set, and working on a musical set.

Non-Performance Activities. A fourth factor comprises six activities involving the visual or literary arts, each oriented towards production rather than consumption. In descending order, these are painting or drawing, creative writing, taking art or writing or music lessons, photography, crafts (other than needlecrafts), and reading or listening to poetry. The additive scale ranges from 0 to 6.

These four scales represent four kinds of cultural participation, varying along two dimensions: performing-arts

vs. visually oriented forms (plastic arts, historical exhibits, literature); and arts consumption v. arts production.

The first scale, performing-arts attendance, includes jazz, which Black Americans attend more frequently than whites, along with five other activities that white respondents are more likely to attend than Black. Because race/-ethnicity thus affects different parts of the scale in different ways, cancelling one another out to a degree, we created a fifth scale by eliminating jazz from the performing-arts attendance activities. Results for the attendance scales including and excluding jazz, respectively, are reported separately throughout.

One focus of this chapter is on the determinants and effects of youthful experience in the arts. As we saw in chapter 2, the SPPA asked respondents whether they had taken several kinds of arts class or lesson and whether their parents had exposed them to several kinds of artistic experience or encouragement. We subjected these measures (restricting classes or lessons to those taken before the age of 18) to factor analysis (Appendix Table 5-2), from which emerged two scales:

Home Socialization: A scale ranging from 0 to 4, consisting of the following items, in descending order: parents took child to plays or concerts; parents listened to classical music; parents took child to art museum; and parents encouraged child to read.

Youthful Lessons: A scale ranging from 0 to 8, consisting of items reporting lessons or classes before age 18 in the following areas, in descending order: visual art making, art appreciation, writing, music appreciation, crafts, acting, instrumental music or singing, and ballet.

Throughout this report, we have speculated about the extent to which differences in participation reflect, on the one hand, obstacles to participation and, on the other, differences in taste. In this chapter, we use two rough proxies for taste for or interest in "high culture." The first is based on a question that asked respondents which of the following kinds of music they like to listen to: classical/-chamber, opera, operetta/Broadway/musical/show tunes, jazz, soul/blues/rhythm and blues, big band, country-western, bluegrass, rock, mood/easy listening, folk, barbershop, and hymns/gospel. Factor analysis (Appendix Table 5-3) yielded three factors, of which classical/chamber, operetta/show tunes, and opera loaded strongly on the first, along with (at lower levels), big band and mood/easy listening music. (Jazz loaded on a distinct factor with soul/blues and rock; and a third factor included bluegrass, country western, folk, barbershop, and hymns/gospel music.) From the components of the first factor, we constructed an additive scale, ranging in value from 0 to 5, which we call Art Music.

A final additive scale is TV Arts, ranging from 0 to 7, with 1 point for each kind of arts programming the respond-

ent reported watching on television. Because such programs are available to most Americans free of charge, we regard this as a rough measure of interest in the arts, unaffected by barriers that may reduce attendance at live events or exhibitions.

In addition to the measures described above, we use the same control variables introduced in chapter 3, as well as three new ones. The latter include father's educational attainment in years (POPED in some tables); mother's educational attainment (MOMED); and the number of hours the respondent reported watching television on an average day (HOURS TV). Because data on father's or mother's education are missing for many cases, these variables are used only for analyses based on a special subsample. Hours of television is included as a control variable for analyses with TV ARTS.

Intergroup Differences in Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales

Let us begin by considering intergroup differences in mean scores on the scales described above. Not surprisingly, the patterns mirror those noted in chapter 2 with respect to the items of which these scales consist. White respondents reported more family socialization experiences (1.13 compared to .86 and .80) than Black or Hispanic respondents, respectively, as well as more kinds of classes or lessons (1.24) than Black (.86) or, especially, Hispanic (.67) Americans. Whites reported liking more of the musical genres loading on the "art music" scale (1.51) than Hispanic (1.08) or, espec-

Table 5-2: Means for Artistic Socialization, Musical Taste, TV Art Viewing, and Artistic Participation Scales by Race

	N	Home	Lessons	Art Music	TV Art
WHITE	1908	1.134	1.240	1.509	1.404
BLACK	230	0.860	0.864	0.720	1.082
HISPANIC	117	0.800	0.667	1.084	1.027

	N	Attend	Attend*	Exhibits	Perform	Do Other
WHITE	1908	0.571	0.483	2.288	0.116	0.762
BLACK	230	0.365	0.197	1.203	0.094	0.449
HISPANIC	117	0.305	0.214	1.597	0.166	0.708

*Excluding attendance at jazz performances.
Means are weighted, Ns are unweighted.

ially, Black (.72) respondents. They also reported watching more kinds of televised arts programs (1.40) than Black or Hispanic Americans (1.08 and 1.02).

Whites also had higher scores than Blacks and Hispanics on all the participation measures but performance activities. The differences were greatest with respect to the visually oriented consumption scale, for which the average for white respondents was 2.29, compared to 1.60 for Hispanic and 1.20 for Black Americans. Intergroup differences in other areas were more modest. Indeed, Hispanics participated in slightly more performance activities and almost as many non-performance activities as whites.

Although differences among groups are notable, especially with respect to consuming, as opposed to producing, art, even more striking is the modest degree of participation evident among any of these groups. Fewer than half the respondents from any group, for example, attended a performing-arts activity other than jazz or participated in a performance, either on stage or backstage. Variation by race or ethnicity is limited, then, because white, Black, and Hispanic Americans all reported low rates of participation.

Race, Ethnicity and Youthful Socialization

Black and Hispanic Americans report fewer youthful arts socialization experiences than do white Americans. Do these differences reflect differences in the degree to which Black, Hispanic, and white parents value the arts? Or do

they, instead, stem from differences in socioeconomic opportunity related to race or ethnicity?

To answer this question, we used multiple regression analysis, a method that lets one estimate net effects of race and ethnicity while holding other potential causal factors constant. In other words, the resulting coefficients describe differences between Blacks and whites and between Hispanics and whites who are similar with respect to the variables for which we have controlled. Table 5-3 reports results of analyses predicting scores on the home socialization scale, and table 5-4 reports results of the analyses for youthful lessons. Independent variables are arrayed vertically to the left of the page. Their statistical effects appear on the right, expressed as standardized coefficients, enabling us to compare the impacts of different predictors in a common metric.

Each table reports results of three separate analyses or models, each containing different sets of variables. The pair of columns to the left of the page, labelled 1a and 1b, report the influence of being Black or Hispanic (as compared to white, the omitted category), without controlling for any other factors. As such, they are comparable to Table 5-2. The second pair of columns, 2a and 2b, report results of models that included controls for gender and age. The column to the right of the page, labelled 3, are based on a model that included controls for parental education.

Table 5-3: Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Parental Socialization Scale/*

I.V.	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a
BLACK	-.073 b	-.092 d	-.073 b	-.099 d	.044 a
HISPANIC	-.071 b	-.078 c	-.076 b	-.085 d	.044 a
FEMALE			.119 d	.099 d	.116 d
AGE			-.114 d	-.156 d	.131 d
POP'S EDUCATION					.336 d
MOM'S EDUCATION					.276 d
d.f.	1750	2254	1750	2254	1750
R Squared	.008	.012	.033	.044	.271

*Additive scale of number of kinds of family-based childhood artistic socialization activities respondents reported. Models labeled "a" are based on only those respondents for whom data on mother's and father's education were available.

Table 5-4: Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Youthful Lessons Scale/*

I.V.	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a
BLACK	-.069 b	-.085 d	-.074 c	-.100 d	-.011
HISPANIC	-.080 c	-.091 d	-.102 d	-.111 d	-.038
FEMALE			.057 a	.051 b	.056 b
AGE			-.341 d	-.371 d	-.209 d
POP'S EDUCATION					.168 d
MOM'S EDUCATION					.159 d
d.f.	1750	2254	1750	2254	1750
R Squared	.009	.013	.125	.151	.192

*Additive scale of number of kinds of lessons or classes respondent reported taking before the age of 18. Models labeled "a" are based on only those respondents for whom data on mother's and father's education were available.

The first two models (1 and 2) are reported in two columns because the analyses were executed twice: once on the full November/December sample and once on a partial subsample, consisting of 1751 cases from November and December that contained data on mother's and father's education. The latter data are somewhat biased, because respondents who could not report their parents' educational level were disproportionately lower in socioeconomic status than the sample as a whole. On the other hand, the subsample includes information that is vital for understanding family influences./2

Columns 1a and 1b of tables 5-3 and 5-4 confirm that Black and Hispanic respondents received significantly less youthful socialization into the arts than their white counterparts. Columns 2a and 2b indicate that this difference remains constant (for parental socialization) or grows (for lessons and classes) after controlling for differences in gender composition and age among the three groups.

2/ Although we undertook all of the analyses reported below on both the full November/December subsample and the partial subsample (of respondents reporting data on parental education), in most cases we report only the results only from the full subsample, because of the nonresponse bias problem. For most taste and participation outcomes, parental education exerts a small positive influence by virtue of its causal relationship to the two socialization measures, which are positively related to participation. In other words, because it seems that more educated parents lead their children to participate more in the arts as adults because they help them have more youthful socialization experiences, classes and lessons in the arts (rather than through some other means not measured by the socialization scores), we can use the more reliable full sample without fear that including measures of parental education would alter our results.

The models reviewed thus far fail to take into account that parents of Black and Hispanic Americans, on average, received considerably less formal education than parents of white Americans. When we control for mother's and father's education in model 3, two things become clear. First, parental education explains much more variation in youthful experience than do race or ethnicity. Second, Black and Hispanic respondents received no less youthful artistic socialization than did white Americans of equivalent age with similarly educated parents. Indeed, both Black and Hispanic respondents reported that their parents gave them slightly, but significantly, more kinds of exposure or encouragement than did whites. Parental education had less influence on classes or lessons, which include those for which the schools as well as the family are responsible. Nonetheless, once one controls for mother's and father's years of schooling, the effects of race and ethnicity on youthful lessons are no longer significant.

Race, Ethnicity, Musical Taste, and Television Arts Viewing

We have seen that Hispanic and, especially, Black respondents reported liking fewer kinds of the genres loading onto the art music scale than whites and viewed somewhat fewer kind of televised arts programs. Do race and ethnicity exert an independent influence on taste for art music or interest in the watching arts programs on television, or do differences stem entirely from intergroup variation in char-

acteristics like socioeconomic status or artistic socialization that are related to artistic tastes or interests?

With respect to scores on the "art music" scale (which includes big bands and easy listening as well as classical music, opera, and musical theatre), being Black, but not being Hispanic, makes a difference (See Table 5-5). Without controls, both Blacks and Hispanics report liking significantly fewer of these musical styles than whites. Controlling for sociodemographic factors eliminates the difference between whites and Hispanics, and accounts for almost half the difference between Blacks and whites. Nonetheless, the remaining effect of race indicates that Black and white musical tastes are significantly different. Controlling for youthful socialization reduces the remaining Black/white margin by only 14 percent, and the difference remains statistically significant.

Race is not a major factor, however, compared to other significant predictors of differences in art-music scores. The effect of age, for example, is almost four times that of race, the influence of educational attainment almost three times as great, the effect of home socialization two times as large, and the influence of childhood lessons twice as substantial. (See Appendix Table 5-5.)

The small but significant tendency for Blacks and Hispanics to report viewing fewer kinds of televised arts programs than whites is entirely the result of sociodemographic differences among these groups. In other words, if we take

Table 5-5: Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Art Music Scale and Number of Kinds of Televised Arts Programs Viewed

	ART MUSIC			TV ARTS		
Model:	1	2	3	1	2	3
BLACK	-.179 d	-.093 d	-.080 d	-.057 b	.017	.028
HISPANIC	-.067 b	.001	.019	-.047 a	.009	.030

Standardized beta coefficients. a=p less than .05; b= p less than .01; c=p less than .001; d=p less than .0001. Model 1 includes no control variables. Model 2 includes controls for gender, age, educational attainment, occupation (white-collar v. other), family income, marital status (single or divorced v. other), and residence in SMSA. Model 3 includes same controls as model 2 as well as controls for home socialization and childhood lessons. Based on 2255-person sample from November/December 1982.

such viewing as a measure of interest in the arts, Black and Hispanic Americans display just as much interest as do whites who are similar in educational attainment, occupational status, income, and related characteristics./3

Race, Ethnicity and Artistic Participation

In this section we consider effects of race and ethnicity scores on five scales of artistic participation: attendance at performing-arts events (jazz included); attendance at performing-arts events (jazz excluded); visiting museums, fairs or exhibits, reading literature, and related activities; on-stage or backstage performance activities; and production activities in the visual, craft, or literary arts.

Throughout this report we have emphasized that artistic participation is multi-dimensional. Because the participation scales used in this chapter vary along two dimensions (consuming/producing, performing-arts/other arts), we can use them to pursue this point. The reader should remember, however, that even the broad array of activities included in the participation scales does not begin to exhaust the diversity of artistic activities in the contemporary United

---

3/ In chapter 2, we raised the question of whether the lesser zero-order difference between Black and white respondents in television viewing than in live attendance was the result of the fact that Black Americans also watched more television, in general, than whites. To explore this possibility, we controlled for hours of television watching of all kinds. Although people who watch lots of television in general also watch significantly more arts television than people who do not, the effect is very small and does not explain the relatively high levels of arts viewing among Black respondents. See Appendix Table 5-6 for the full model.

States. In particular, except for jazz, the SPPA did not ask people about art forms or activities with special links to Black, Hispanic, or other American racial or ethnic minority communities.

Absent controls for other variables (Table 5-6, model 1 under each participation heading), Black respondents reported participating in fewer items than white Americans on each scale except performance production activities. Hispanic respondents reported fewer consumption activities than whites, but not fewer production activities. None of the zero-order differences is very large, although the differences between Blacks and whites with respect to visually oriented consumption activities and, to a lesser extent, attending performances (excluding jazz) are moderate.

When sociodemographic controls are entered into the predictive equations (model 2), the negative effects of being Black on performance attendance disappear (with jazz included) or become insignificant (with jazz excluded). Controlling for such factors as educational attainment, family income, having a white-collar occupation, and marital status eliminates all of the difference between Blacks and whites on the performance-attendance scale that includes jazz, and almost 80 percent of the difference on the scale excluding jazz. Sociodemographic controls also reduce the effect of race on visually oriented consumption activities by more than 40 percent, and on visual-art, craft and literary acti-

Table 5-6: Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Arts Participation-Scales

	ATTEND PERFORMANCES				ATTEND PERFORMANCES/*			
Model:	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.067 b	.015	.026	.031	-.107 d	-.022	-.013	-.006
HISPANIC	-.061 b	-.002	.012	.001	-.070 c	-.008	.004	-.007

	VISUAL CONSUMPTION				PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES			
Model:	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.199 d	-.115 d	-.101 d	-.094 d	-.016	-.004	.003	.007
HISPANIC	-.088 d	-.024	-.004	-.016	.025	.038	.049 a	.045 a

	OTHER ACTIVITIES			
Model:	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.091 d	-.056 b	-.035	-.032
HISPANIC	-.011	.016	.043 a	.034

*Second attendance scale does not include jazz.
Standardized beta coefficients. a=p less than .05; b= p less than .01; c=p less than .001; d=p less than .0001. Model 1 includes no control variables. Model 2 includes controls for gender, age, educational attainment, occupation (white-collar v. other), family income, marital status (single or divorced v. other), and residence in SMSA. Model 3 includes same controls as model 2 as well as controls for home socialization and childhood lessons. Model 4 includes same controls as model 3 as well as controls for art music scale, TV arts viewing, and hours spent watching all kinds of television on average day. Based on 2255-person sample from November/December 1982.

vities by almost as much, but the differences between whites and Blacks remain statistically significant in these areas.

Sociodemographic differences account for almost all of the difference between whites and Hispanics in performance attendance and more than 70 percent of the gap in the exhibit-visiting scale. When these characteristics are controlled, being Hispanic has no significant influence on any form of participation.

The third model adds controls for youthful socialization (both at home and through lessons and classes) to the sociodemographic measures. These additional controls reduce the remaining effect of being Black on exhibit visiting by only 12 percent, leaving a small but statistically significant difference between otherwise similar Blacks and whites. They reduce the Black coefficient for nonperformance creative activities by almost 40 percent, to nonsignificance.

Although the impact of being Black on the exhibit visiting scale is statistically significant, it is small relative the influence of other predictors. For example, it is less than half the size of the effects of educational attainment, gender, and childhood socialization, and well below the influence of youthful lessons./4

We have already seen that whenever Hispanics had significantly lower scores on participation scales than whites, these differences were almost entirely the consequence of

---

4/ The full models are displayed in Appendix Tables 5-6 through 5-10.

intergroup sociodemographic differences. With respect to the consumption scales -- performance attendance and visually oriented activities -- controlling for youthful experience makes no notable difference. With respect to the art-producing activities, both performance and nonperformance, when one controls for youthful socialization into the arts, Hispanic Americans are involved in slightly, but significantly, more activities than are whites. In other words, Hispanic respondents reported participating in more artistic production activities than did white or Black respondents of similar socioeconomic status and with comparable socialization into the arts.

With respect to nonperformance activities, the positive effect of being Hispanic is small relative to that of other predictors: about one eighth as large as childhood lessons, less than one third the effect of home socialization, less than half the size of educational attainment, and smaller than the effects of white-collar occupation, age, income, marital status, and living in an SMSA. By contrast, the coefficient for Hispanic origin, although small, is one of only four significant predictors of onstage or offstage performance activities, and the largest demographic predictor other than income.

The fourth models we investigated added three new control variables: the art-music scale, the TV art viewing scale, and a measure of hours watched per day of all kinds of television. These additional controls did not materially

alter the results of the earlier models, except in so far as they reduced the coefficient for Hispanic as a predictor of participation in nonperformance production activities to insignificance. What this means is that more than one fifth of the advantage associated with being Hispanic in nonperformance production ("other activities") results from Hispanic respondents having musical tastes and viewing habits associated with this kind of participation.

Summary of Findings Thus Far

The analyses reported above clarify certain issues raised in earlier chapters. In chapter 2, we saw that Black and Hispanic respondents received fewer home socialization experiences into reading and the fine arts and took fewer arts-related classes or lessons at an early stage than did whites. In this chapter, we have seen that these differences are entirely a result of the fact that Black and Hispanic respondents had parents who had received fewer years of formal education than did the parents of white respondents. Controlling for parental education, Black and Hispanic parents gave their children significantly more kinds of home socialization experiences than did comparable white parents. To the extent that the way one socializes one's children reflects the value one places on the arts, then Black and Hispanic families appear to value the arts (and reading) as much as comparable white ones.

In chapters 2 and 3 we raised the question of whether differences in participation between whites on the one hand,

and Black and Hispanics on the other, resulted from differences in opportunity or from differences in taste. In this chapter we have looked at two proxy indicators of taste for the fine arts. The first, a scale of the number of kinds of art music and related genres respondents said they enjoyed, is a fairly direct indicator of a narrow spectrum of taste. The second, a scale of the number of kinds of arts programs respondents reported viewing on television, is a more indirect indicator of interest in the arts defined more broadly.

If we treat television arts viewing as an indicator of interest in the arts, then we see that Black and Hispanic Americans are no less interested in the arts than are white Americans of similar socioeconomic status. The same is true for Hispanic Americans of taste for classical and related forms of music. By contrast, Black Americans do report liking fewer kinds of art music (but recall that this scale includes big band, Broadway, and easy listening music, as well as classical) than whites, and only about half of the difference is explained by sociodemographic characteristics. However, the results reported in Table 5-6 for model 4 indicate that this small difference in taste cannot explain interracial differences in any of the arts participation scales.

Whereas most of the core questions examined in chapter 3 concerned attendance at live, high-culture, performing-arts events, use of the "other participation" items in con-

structing the participation scales permitted us to distinguish among the determinants of different kinds of participation. The analyses further confirmed that one cannot generalize about the effects of race or ethnicity on cultural participation per se. Hispanic Americans attend fewer public arts consumption activities than whites, but this difference is almost entirely the result of the fact that white Americans have more years of education, higher incomes, and higher status occupations. When these factors are controlled, Hispanic Americans participate in active art-making activities significantly more than do white Americans.

Black/white differences in participation also vary for different kinds of activities. There is no statistically significant difference between Black and white respondents with respect to participating on-stage or backstage in performing-arts events. And the significant difference between Black and white Americans in the number of kinds of performing-arts events attended stems almost entirely from differences between Blacks and whites in sociodemographic characteristics other than race./5 Significant, albeit relative-

---

5/ This finding was unexpected for the performance attendance scale that excluded jazz attendance, which Black respondents reported at higher rates than whites, because the logistic regression analyses reported in chapter 3 revealed that Black respondents were less likely to have attended most of the activities included in the performance attendance scale even after controlling for sociodemographic factors. But although they were statistically significant, these differences were small. The apparent difference stems from the difference in sizes between the full sample and the November/December subsample. Because the latter is smaller than the former, effects are less likely to be statistically significant. To confirm this, we reran logistic models us-

ly small, differences between white and Black respondents who are similar in sociodemographic profile did appear with respect to the scales measuring visually oriented consumption activities and in the nonperformance creative activity scale. The latter difference was attributable to differences between Blacks and whites in youthful artistic sociali-

---

ing only November/December data. Although the coefficients for race were comparable in magnitude to those for the full sample, once sociodemographic controls were added the effects of race on attendance at performing-arts events (other than jazz) were not statistically significant. We also considered and ruled out three alternative explanations for the apparent disparity in results. First, we asked if they resulted from systematic differences between the November/-December subsample and the sample for 1982 as a whole. But, as Table 5-1 indicates, Black/white differences in the likelihood of attendance at core performing-arts activities were about as large for the November/December subsample as for the 1982 sample as a whole. Moreover, regression analyses to predict the performing-arts attendance scales using the full sample (Appendix table 5-5) yielded results that were substantively the same as those from the November/December size (although the large size of the full sample made the tiny effect of race statistically significant). Second, we considered the possibility that racial effects might have been altered because a somewhat shorter list of control variables was employed in the analyses in chapter 5 than in the analyses in chapter 3 (due to the merging of several occupational, marital, and residence categories). If anything, however, this would have magnified the effects of race by eliminating variation in control variables with which both race and participation are correlated. Third, we considered the possibility that the logarithmic form used in the logistic regression analyses in chapter 3 better represented the relationship between race and participation than the linear models reported above. To test this possibility, we ran the models using the logarithmic form of the attendance scale, and discovered that this transformation made no substantive difference to the results. Having eliminated these three alternative explanations, we feel confident in attributing the difference to the smaller size of the November/December subsample. Because a sample of 2255 (the size of the November/December subsample) is sufficiently large that no substantively important effect could be deemed insignificant, we are satisfied with the reliability of these findings.

zation, whereas the former persisted even after controls for socialization, musical taste and televised arts viewing.

One advantage of multiple regression analysis over logistic regression analysis (the method used in chapter 3) is that it enables one to compared the relative influence of different predictive factors using a common metric. The analyses reported above indicate that even in those relatively few cases in which race or ethnicity affect artistic outcomes after controlling for intergroup sociodemographic differences, those effects are usually dwarfed by those of childhood socialization, educational attainment, and exceeded by other measures of socioeconomic status.

In other words, at least for the range of participation measures about which the SPPA surveys asked, most differences among white, Black, and Hispanic respondents result from differences in the sociodemographic attributes of members of these groups. Where differences in participation other than those for which such factors account are found, they vary among kinds of participation. Black Americans report receiving more kinds of home socialization into the arts, like art music and related genres less (but like jazz more), visit fewer kinds of public exhibitions less, and engage in fewer arts, crafts, and literary creative activities than whites who are comparable with respect to sociodemographic characteristics. Hispanic Americans report benefiting from more kinds of family socialization and participate in more active art-making activities (both performance and non-per-

formance) than white Americans who are comparable sociodemographically and with respect to youthful socialization. Such net differences, where they are present, are in most cases small relative other predictors of artistic socialization, interest, and participation.

Differences in Models Predicting Artistic Socialization, Taste, and Participation by Race

Do the same factors predict cultural outcomes for Blacks, Hispanics, and whites, or do members of these groups follow separate paths to artistic participation? Differences in the predictors of participation are relevant both to understanding intergroup differences in the extent of participation and to evaluating the likely effects of programs and policies aimed at reducing such differences.

In this section we investigate differences in the predictors of socialization, taste and participation by applying the same predictive models described in the previous section (excluding the dichotomous Black and Hispanic variables, of course) separately to respondents from each group. For the socialization variables (parental socialization and youthful lessons) these analyses employ the subsample with data on mother's and father's educational attainment and also included gender and age. For art music and TV art viewing, the full November/December subsample is used for two separate models: with sociodemographic predictors, and with both sociodemographic and socialization variables included. For the artistic participation scales

(performance attendance with and without jazz, exhibit visiting, performance production activities, and nonperformance production activities), three models are run using the full November/December subsample: with sociodemographic predictors only; with sociodemographic and youthful socialization independent variables; and with sociodemographic, youthful socialization, and taste proxy measures all included.

Table 5-7 reports all instances where predictors for two or more groups are significantly different across comparable models. (The full models are reported in Appendix Tables 5-13 through 5-20.) Most significant differences are between whites and Blacks or between whites and Hispanics. In part, this is an artifact of sample size: Because the number of white respondents is much greater than the number of Black or Hispanic respondents, differences between whites and other groups are more likely to be statistically significant than gaps between Hispanics and Blacks./6

Youthful socialization. There were no significant intergroup differences in the predictors of youthful classes and lessons. By contrast, once parental education was controlled, age was a significantly positive predictor for whites but a significantly negative predictor for Blacks. What this means is that whereas white parents of equivalent educational levels have been providing fewer kinds of home

---

6/ To assess significance, we employed the rule of thumb that a difference between the unstandardized coefficients representing the effects of a given predictor for two groups is statistically significant if it is at least twice as large as the sum of the standard errors.

Table 5-7: Significant Differences in Models Predicting Scores on Artistic Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales for Black, Hispanic, and White Subsamples/*

SCALE	PREDICTOR	
Parental Socialization	AGE	Significantly positive for whites, negative for Blacks, controlling for gender and parental education
Youthful Lessons	None	
TV Art Viewing	AGE	Significantly positive for whites, only slightly positive for Blacks with sociodemographic controls
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for both whites and Blacks, but effect for whites significantly stronger, with sociodemographic controls
Art Music	AGE	Significant positive effect for whites, insignificant weak effects for Blacks and Hispanics, both with sociodemographic controls only and with sociodemographic and socialization controls
	EDUCATION	With sociodemographic controls, strongly significant for whites, significant but less so for Blacks; with socialization controls, still strongly significant for whites, insignificant for Blacks
Performance Attendance inc. Jazz	EDUCATION	More strongly significant for whites than for Blacks with sociodemographic controls only; insignificant for Hispanics with sociodemographic controls and negative for Hispanics with additional controls

Table 5-7 (con.)

Performance Attendance exc. Jazz	EDUCATION	More strongly significant for whites than for Blacks with sociodemographic and socialization controls; insignificant for Hispanics with sociodemographic controls and negative with other controls
	SMSA	Significantly positive for whites, negative for Blacks with sociodemographic controls; negative and significant for Blacks, insignificant for whites with sociodemographic and socialization controls
Exhibition Visiting	EDUCATION	Strongly significant for whites, all models; for Blacks, more weakly significant with sociodemographic controls, insignificant with other controls
	OCCUPATION (white-collar)	More significantly positive for Blacks than for whites with sociodemographic controls; significantly positive for Hispanics, insignificant for whites, with sociodemographic, socialization, and taste controls
	GENDER (female)	Significantly positive for whites, insignificant for Hispanics, all models
	HOME SOCIALIZATION	More significantly positive for Blacks than for whites, all models
	TV ART VIEWING	More significantly positive for Hispanics than for whites
Performance Activity	INCOME	Significantly negative for whites, all models; significantly positive for Hispanics with sociodemographic and with sociodemographic and socialization controls, and positive but insignificant with all controls

Table 5-7 (con.)

Nonperformance Activity	AGE	Significantly negative for whites, positive for Blacks, with all controls
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Blacks with sociodemographic controls
	OCCUPATION (white-collar)	Significantly positive for Blacks, all models; significantly but less positive for whites, models with sociodemographic and with sociodemographic and socialization controls, insignificant in model with all controls
	HOME SOCIALIZATION	Significantly positive for Hispanics but not for Blacks, model with socialization controls
	TV ART VIEWING	Significantly positive for Hispanics, less significantly positive for whites, not significant for Blacks

*For full models, see Appendix Tables 5-11 through 5-17.

socialization over the lifetimes of our respondents, comparable black parents have been providing more kinds of home socialization over that same time span. This trend, along with increases in educational attainment among Black Americans, might be expected to moderate or eliminate Black/white differences in parental socialization.

Taste/interest proxies. Older white respondents watched significantly more kinds of televised arts programs and reported liking significantly more kinds of art music, other things equal, than younger whites. By contrast, older Black and Hispanic respondents were no more likely than otherwise comparable younger ones to have high scores on these scales. Significant differences in effects of age for whites as compared to Blacks (for art music and TV art viewing) and Hispanics (for art music) suggest the possibility of a convergence in musical taste and interest in the arts. Although these differences may simply represent an absence of aging effects in the minority subpopulations, they may instead reflect cohort change in the Black and Hispanic communities. One other intergroup difference was evident: Educational attainment was more strongly and positively predictive of TV art viewing and liking for art music and related genres for white than for Black respondents.

Participation Scales. The most notable intergroup difference was that educational attainment was more strongly related for whites than for Blacks to performing-arts attendance (both including and excluding jazz), exhibition atten-

dance and related activities, and nonperformance creative activities. In most cases, the effect of education was significant for Blacks as well as whites, but smaller in magnitude. A similar difference appeared in the difference between white and Hispanic respondents in education effects on performing-arts attendance (both including and excluding jazz), but not on the other participation scales.

In other words, to use the language of economics, returns to investments in education in the form of increased participation in a range of artistic activities are larger for whites than for Blacks or Hispanics. One possible explanation for such a finding is that Black respondents may have received different kinds of education than white respondents. If, for example, Blacks were more likely to go to high schools where the arts were not stressed, to take vocational rather than college preparatory courses, to attend community colleges rather than liberal arts colleges, or to major in technical or business subjects rather than in the humanities, any of these factors might account for the differences in the effects of education.

By contrast, the effects of having a white-collar occupation on nonperformance consumption and production activities were larger for Blacks than for whites, as were occupation effects on exhibition visiting and related activities for Hispanics. In other words, there is some evidence that, at least with respect to nonperformance items, occupation plays a more important role in structuring the participation

of Blacks and Hispanics whereas education is dominant in determining participation levels of whites.

Other intergroup differences in the effects of sociodemographic factors were restricted to just one form of participation in the arts. Living in an SMSA had a positive effect on performing-arts attendance (excluding jazz) for white respondents, but a negative influence on attendance for Blacks. Other things equal, white women were more likely to visit museums and exhibits than white men, but no such gender difference appeared in the Hispanic subsample. Family income was positively related to onstage and backstage performance activities for Hispanic respondents, but negatively related to such activities for whites. Consistent with findings described in chapter 3, the gap in participation between women and men was greater among whites than among Blacks for all the scales, but unlike those analyses, the differences never reached statistical significance.

In general, the effects of home socialization on participation-scale scores were weaker, although still significant, for whites than for members of other groups. The only difference that was significant, however, was for visually oriented consumption activities, where parental socialization exerted a significantly stronger impact on participation by Black respondents than by that of whites.

In chapter 2, we noted that differences between Blacks and whites with respect to taking classes or lessons in the arts were relatively small, compared to differences in par-

ticipation in the core activity items, and speculated as to the efficacy of the schools in increasing equality of opportunity for participation in the arts. Except for the performance attendance scale that included jazz, the effects of youthful lessons or classes in the arts was smaller for Blacks than for whites or Hispanics. This finding is consistent with the lower effects of educational attainment on participation for Blacks than for whites, and may indicate either that Blacks took different kinds of classes or lessons than members of other groups or that, for some other reason, classes or lessons were less efficacious in stimulating adult activity among Blacks than among other respondents. On the other hand, these differences, although pervasive, never reached statistical significance, so, at most, they suggest hypotheses for further research.

In chapter 2, we also noted the smaller differences in patterns of watching the arts on television than in patterns of live attendance between white Americans, on the one hand, and Black and Hispanic Americans, on the other, and speculated as to whether television might be a force for increasing minority participation in the arts. For Hispanic respondents, this hypothesis seems to be a credible one: watching televised arts programs is significantly related to each of the participation scales, even after controlling for sociodemographic factors, socialization measures, taste for art music, and amount of television viewing of all kinds. For each scale, the impact of arts television viewing is greater

for Hispanics than for any other group, and for the nonperformance scales, both visually oriented consumption and nonperformance production activities, the relationship is significantly stronger for Hispanic respondents than for Blacks. By contrast, for Blacks, viewing the arts on television has a weaker effect on each of the participation scales than for whites or for Hispanics, and is a significant predictor only of the performance attendance scales. The effects of arts TV viewing on participation for whites is intermediate between that for Hispanics and Blacks for each kind of participation.

What can we make of these differences? One possibility is that televised arts programs boosts arts participation among Hispanic Americans more than among Blacks or whites. A plausible alternative explanation is that participating in the arts as consumers or producers makes Hispanics want to watch arts programs on television more than it does Blacks or whites. Or arts program viewing may simply be a better proxy measure of interest in the arts for Hispanics than for members of other groups. These possibilities can at best serve as hypotheses for further research, especially given the fact that only two of the intergroup differences are statistically significant.

Taken together, however, the findings suggest an intriguing and potentially important hypothesis: the links between youthful classes and lessons (but not parental socialization), formal education, televised arts viewing, and

artistic participation may be weaker among Black Americans than for the Hispanic or white subpopulations. Whether this conclusion would survive replication, given the statistical insignificance of many of the results, is uncertain. If the hypotheses are confirmed, it remains to be seen whether the differences result from differences in the kinds of education Black and other Americans receive, the kinds of classes they take, and the kinds of televised arts programs they watch; or from aspects of the Black experience that blunt the impact of education on artistic interests and behavior.

Do Intergroup Differences Vary by Gender, Educational Attainment or Age?

Table 5-8 displays means by race for subsamples based on differences among respondents in educational attainment, gender, and age. The educational attainment categories are less than high school, high school graduation but no further education, some college, and at least college graduation. Age categories were derived by dividing the population into three groups of similar size: 18 to 30, 31 to 51, and older than 51 years of age.

The educational means must be interpreted with caution, because only 16 Black respondents and only 5 Hispanic respondents in the November/December sample had 16 or more years of formal education, and only 28 Blacks and 20 Hispanics had attended college for 1 to 3 years. Differences in means between Black and white respondents were smaller (expressed as ratios) among college graduates than among other

Table 5-8: Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables by Race by Education, Gender, Age -- Including Respondents without Data on Parental Education

	N	Lessons	Home	Art Music	Attend	Visit	Attend No Jazz	Perform	Dovis	Tvart
EDUCATION										
11 & Less										
White	447	0.528	0.550	0.894	0.148	1.065	0.129	0.079	0.276	0.660
		1.054	0.674	1.195	0.482	1.203	0.447	0.346	0.692	1.333
Black	106	0.318	0.516	0.316	0.115	0.467	0.058	0.023	0.143	0.668
		0.752	0.659	0.927	0.319	0.812	0.233	0.149	0.452	1.338
Hispanic	54	0.290	0.626	0.886	0.161	0.966	0.088	0.152	0.494	0.806
		0.810	0.919	1.272	0.368	1.331	0.284	0.496	0.927	1.681
12 Years										
White	801	1.187	1.027	1.368	0.387	2.275	0.323	0.082	0.694	1.260
		1.312	0.870	1.287	0.785	1.630	0.696	0.341	1.025	1.689
Black	80	1.272	0.990	0.872	0.304	1.400	0.084	0.181	0.469	1.200
		1.557	0.824	1.168	0.549	1.586	0.337	0.502	0.874	1.498
Hispanic	38	1.093	0.804	1.239	0.332	1.954	0.264	0.244	0.781	0.955
		1.297	0.650	1.062	0.738	1.653	0.553	0.642	1.317	1.455
13-15 YRS										
White	342	1.758	1.558	1.833	0.837	2.779	0.700	0.166	1.044	1.676
		1.580	0.963	1.490	1.169	1.674	1.023	0.536	1.297	1.847
Black	28	1.082	1.285	1.086	0.677	1.993	0.432	0.111	0.910	1.299
		1.206	0.855	1.384	0.906	1.686	0.735	0.400	1.102	1.526
Hispanic	20	0.714	1.209	1.344	0.605	2.347	0.460	0.101	1.069	1.687
		0.760	0.589	1.202	1.209	1.316	0.896	0.301	1.412	1.722
16 & Over										
White	318	1.781	1.738	2.339	1.308	3.457	1.120	0.194	1.286	2.471
		1.510	1.025	1.427	1.345	1.596	1.196	0.618	1.305	2.103
Black	16	1.649	1.438	1.625	1.474	3.001	1.046	0.067	1.242	2.427
		1.566	0.940	1.371	1.534	1.875	1.127	0.249	1.119	2.286
Hispanic	5	1.292	0.987	1.022	0.432	2.602	0.216	0.000	1.006	1.271
		1.179	0.458	1.602	0.833	2.220	0.411	0.000	1.256	1.992

Table 5-8 (con.)

	N	Lessons	Home	Art Music	Attend	Visit	Attend No Jazz	Perform	Davis	Tvart
GENDER										
Male										
White	860	1.177	1.033	1.357	0.475	1.839	0.389	0.094	0.688	1.319
		1.344	0.896	1.349	0.906	1.594	0.787	0.399	1.075	1.770
Black	92	0.921	0.783	0.652	0.361	0.890	0.168	0.090	0.450	1.055
		1.450	0.823	1.217	0.754	1.249	0.511	0.341	0.855	1.621
Hispanic	56	0.631	0.817	0.994	0.241	1.473	0.161	0.134	0.742	1.085
		1.020	0.722	1.069	0.692	1.351	0.496	0.469	1.223	1.593
Female										
White	48	1.296	1.225	1.645	0.657	2.690	0.567	0.135	0.828	1.480
		1.494	1.029	1.459	1.096	1.756	0.974	0.477	1.162	1.864
Black	138	0.818	0.922	0.776	0.369	1.457	0.220	0.097	0.447	1.104
		1.199	0.847	1.171	0.780	1.684	0.603	0.375	0.864	1.599
Hispanic	61	0.703	0.783	1.175	0.368	1.723	0.268	0.197	0.675	0.988
		1.120	0.870	1.368	0.778	1.824	0.590	0.556	1.156	1.738
AGE										
18-30										
White	605	1.915	1.288	1.023	0.528	2.511	0.401	0.136	1.142	1.134
		1.653	0.921	1.113	0.982	1.712	0.811	0.467	1.349	1.535
Black	80	1.454	1.018	0.680	0.544	1.606	0.197	0.140	0.600	1.310
		1.515	0.799	1.099	0.809	1.609	0.555	0.465	0.969	1.881
Hispanic	44	1.058	0.917	1.229	0.282	1.874	0.196	0.248	1.167	1.177
		1.268	0.589	1.145	0.765	1.621	0.549	0.629	1.469	1.830
31-51										
White	647	1.192	1.129	1.751	0.693	2.517	0.595	0.148	0.789	1.547
		1.303	0.965	1.468	1.052	1.696	0.962	0.519	1.082	1.877
Black	74	0.737	0.950	0.964	0.312	1.244	0.223	0.078	0.506	1.044
		1.238	0.909	1.340	0.769	1.611	0.589	0.267	0.913	1.517
Hispanic	47	0.481	0.794	1.019	0.386	1.701	0.287	0.062	0.494	0.989
		0.811	0.806	1.251	0.817	1.709	0.629	0.318	0.955	1.645

Table 5-6 (con.)

	N	Lessons	Home	Art Music	Attend	Visit	Attend No Jazz	Perform	Dovis	Tvart
Over 51										
White	656	0.660	0.996	1.717	0.488	1.852	0.446	0.065	0.382	1.511
		0.979	1.007	1.498	0.961	1.710	0.888	0.313	0.746	1.978
Black	78	0.208	0.535	0.484	0.184	0.604	0.165	0.050	0.172	0.815
		0.543	0.706	1.069	0.648	1.062	0.544	0.276	0.492	1.599
Hispanic	28	0.309	0.603	0.945	0.197	0.914	0.115	0.209	0.283	0.928
		0.872	1.037	1.309	0.475	1.135	0.319	0.548	0.618	1.752

groups with respect to taste for art music, performing-arts attendance, museum and exhibition visiting, and nonperformance creative activities. By contrast, the gaps between Hispanics and whites in participation (again, expressed in ratios) tended to be greater among the more highly educated. (For example, Hispanics without high-school degrees had higher means than their non-Hispanic white counterparts on performing-arts attendance (including jazz), watching arts television, and participating in performance and nonperformance production activities.

Comparisons of intergroup differences by age are also complicated by small subsample sizes. Nonetheless, the results are striking (see Table 5-9). Comparing mean scores of respondents 52 years of age or over, 31 to 51 years old, and 18 to 30 years of age, we see that the ratio of Black to white means declines monotonically for lessons and classes, art music, televised art viewing, performing-arts attendance (including and excluding jazz), and visually oriented consumption activities. Indeed a convergence of Black and white participation is visible for all but performance and nonperformance arts production activities. Among the youngest cohort, Black means were higher than white for viewing art programs on television, performance attendance (including jazz), and onstage and backstage performance activities.

Reductions among age groups of the white/Hispanic ratios are less marked than those for whites and Blacks (perhaps due to higher levels of Hispanic immigration), but a monot-

Table 5-9: Ratios of White to Black and of White to Hispanic Weighted Means for Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales, by Age of Respondent (Nov./Dec. 1982 Subsample)

Ratios, white means:Black means

Age	Home Socialization	Lessons	Art Music	TV Art	Attend (w/jazz)
18-30	1.27	1.32	1.50	0.87	0.97
31-51	1.19	1.62	1.82	1.48	2.23
52+	1.86	3.17	3.55	1.85	2.65

	Attend (no jazz)	Exhibits	Perform	Other Creative
18-30	2.04	1.56	0.97	1.90
31-51	2.67	2.02	1.90	1.56
52+	2.70	3.07	1.30	2.22

Ratios, white means:Hispanic means

Age	Home Socialization	Lessons	Art Music	TV Art	Attend (w/jazz)
18-30	1.40	1.81	0.83	0.96	1.87
31-51	1.48	2.48	1.72	1.56	1.80
52+	1.65	2.14	1.82	1.82	2.48

	Attend (no jazz)	Exhibits	Perform	Other Creative
18-30	2.05	1.34	0.55	0.98
31-51	2.07	1.48	2.39	1.60
52+	3.88	2.03	0.31	1.35

Number of Respondents

Age	White	Black	Hispanic
18-30	605	80	44
31-51	647	74	47
52+	656	76	26

onic trend appears with respect to home socialization activities, art music, televised art viewing, attendance activities (excluding jazz), and visiting exhibits, museums and related activities. Among the youngest cohort, Hispanic means are higher than white means for taste for art music, television art viewing, and both performance and other creative activities.

Do these declining differences reflect changes in the net effects of race and ethnicity, or changes in the sociodemographic profiles of Black and Hispanic Americans over the past decades? There is good reason to believe the latter is the case, especially changes in levels of formal education attained by Hispanic and Black Americans. Among the over-51 subsample, the average white respondent had 11.25 years of education; the average Black respondent, 7.43; and the average Hispanic, 6.52. Among the subsample aged 18 to 30, the white average was 12.82, while the Black average had risen to 12.33 and the Hispanic average had increased to 11.87. Given the powerful role of education in stimulating participation in the arts, we would expect such relative advances for Black and Hispanic Americans should make these groups more similar to whites in patterns of taste and artistic participation.

Appendix Tables 5-21 through 5-29 report results of regression analyses on subpopulations defined by educational attainment, gender, and age. Our focus was on significant differences in the effects of being Black or Hispanic on

outcome measures for different demographically defined subsamples. Due to the small number of Black and Hispanic respondents, such differences would have to be substantial to reach statistical significance, so these tables represent a conservative test.

No significant differences were found between the racial or ethnic effects on dependent variables for male and female subsamples. Nor were notable differences found in the effects of race or ethnicity on outcomes for subpopulations with varying amounts of formal education./7

In analyses for subpopulations defined on the basis of age, only two models revealed significant differences in race effects associated with respondent age. Controlling for other sociodemographic characteristics, being Black had a significant negative impact on the nonperformance creative activity scale for respondents aged 18 to 30, compared to a slight but insignificant positive effect on the scores of respondents over the age of 51. (This difference became nonsignificant when controls for parental socialization were introduced.) By contrast, among the youngest subsample, once sociodemographic and socialization factors were controlled, Black respondents expressed significantly more liking for art music and related genres than whites. The net

---

7/ The single significant difference was that the significantly negative impact of being Hispanic on childhood lessons (without controls for parental education) was greater for men and women with 13 to 15 years of formal education than for persons who had not graduated high school. The result is trivial and defies interpretation.

effect of race on the art music scale for respondents aged 52 or older was significantly negative and significantly different from the effect for younger respondents.

These results are interesting exceptions to the rule, general for all effects of Hispanic origin and for effects of being Black in all but these two models: minority and white young people are less different in most aspects of artistic socialization, taste, and participation than their elders because they are less different with respect to sociodemographic factors that influence artistic outcomes, and not because of changes over time in the net effect of race or ethnicity on outcomes, once sociodemographic factors are controlled.

Summary

White respondents had higher mean scores on all the art socialization, taste, and participation scales than Black and, with the exception of performance activities, Hispanic respondents. Intergroup differences were modest because scores for all groups were low, and differences were greater for arts consumption than for arts production.

Black and Hispanic respondents reported receiving fewer kind of artistic socialization experiences at home and taking fewer kinds of arts lessons or classes as children and adolescents than white respondents because their parents had less formal education than white parents. Blacks and Hispanics reported about the same number of classes and les-

sons and significantly more home socialization experiences than whites of comparable age and family background.

Hispanics liked art music and watched as many televised arts programs as whites with comparable sociodemographic characteristics, and the art television viewing habits of Blacks were similar to those of sociodemographically comparable whites. By contrast, sociodemographic differences account for only half of the significant tendency for Blacks to report enjoying fewer kinds of art music and related genres than whites, and differences in youthful socialization explained little of the remaining gap. Thus small but significant differences in musical taste are directly related to race.

The effects of being Black or Hispanic on participation varied depending upon whether the activities entailed the consumption or the production of art and whether the activities involved the performing arts or the visual and literary arts. Both Hispanics and Blacks score significantly lower than whites on all three arts consumption scales. By contrast, there is no significant difference between Hispanic and white respondents on either production scale, or between Blacks and whites with respect to onstage or backstage performance activities. The gap between Blacks and whites is wider for the visual and literary arts than for the performing arts.

Despite the zero-order differences, Hispanic Americans participate in about as many arts consumption activities as

sociodemographically comparable whites. Hispanic Americans report being involved in more production activities (of both kinds) than sociodemographically similar white Americans with similar amounts of youthful artistic socialization.

Significant differences between Blacks and whites in performing-arts attendance are also fully accounted for by sociodemographic differences between the two groups. By contrast, sociodemographic factors explain only about two fifths of the Black/white difference visually oriented consumption and production activities. Controlling for youthful socialization eliminates the significant gap between Blacks and whites with respect to visual-art and literary production, but has little effect on Black/white differences in exhibit attendance, literature reading, and related activities. The latter difference remains significant even after controls for artistic taste and interest are added.

Taken together these findings indicate that intergroup differences vary across different kinds of participation, that such differences are largely the result of sociodemographic variation between whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, and that such effects of race or ethnicity as remain once sociodemographic factors are controlled are small relative the impact of such variables as educational attainment and youthful socialization.

For the most part, artistic socialization, taste, and participation measures were predicted by the same variables for Blacks and Hispanics as for whites. Two exceptions were

notable, however. The first of these had to do the effects of age on parental socialization, musical taste, and arts television watching. With parental education controlled, it appears that white parents offer fewer arts socialization experiences than they used to, while Black parents offer more, suggesting that a convergence is occuring. Similarly, controlling for other sociodemographic factors, tastes for art music and TV art program viewing increased with age for whites, but not for Blacks and Hispanics. (Differences were significant except for white/Hispanic TV arts program viewing.) Although these results could mean that white Americans' tastes change more with aging than those of Black or Hispanic Americans, it seems more likely to indicate a convergence of all groups with respect to tastes for art music and convergence between Black and white Americans in artistic interest as expressed through watching arts programs on television. These findings are consistent with inspection of means by race and age: among younger respondents, intergroup differences in socialization, taste for art music, and arts television watching are smaller than for older respondents.

Second, education had a stronger effect on arts television viewing and on all of the participation scales except for performance production activities for whites than for Blacks, although in most cases it was a significant predictor for both groups. Although the differences were not significant, the effects on the participation scales of taking

lessons or classes in the arts were also weaker for Blacks than for other groups. The same was true of watching arts television programs, and the differences between Blacks and Hispanics were significant with respect to nonperformance consumption and production activities. In other words, there is some evidence that formal education, both general and arts-specific, is more weakly related to interest and participation in the arts for Blacks than for other groups.

For most participation activities, gaps between white and minority subpopulations were greater for older than for younger respondents. The declining intergroup differences appear to be the result of changes in the sociodemographic profiles of Black, Hispanic, and white Americans, especially rapid increases in the educational attainment of the two former groups, rather than of changes in the effects of race on the participation of otherwise similar men and women.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

In chapter 1. we called attention to three distinct ways of thinking about "underrepresentation" of groups as participants in artistic activities The first focusses on differences in rates of participation. In this view. any statistical underrepresentation is a matter of public concern. The second emphasized differences in net rates of participation between people who are similar in terms of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics other than race or ethnicity. In this view. differing rates of participation are of concern only if they stem directly from racial or ethnic identity. The third perspective asks whether differences in participation. gross or net. result from differences in taste or demand between groups or from differences in the degree to which groups face different obstacles to participation. In this view. varying participation is a concern only if it results from inequality of opportunity to participate rather than from differences in taste.

Which of these perspectives one favors will depend on one's attitudes towards more general issues of inequality. It will also depend on one's beliefs about artistic participation. If one believes that participation in the arts is absolutely essential to an acceptable quality of life. one is more likely to believe that absolute differences in participation are important. If one believes that participation in the arts is a good thing. but not so important as

education. income. or good jobs. one may be more likely to focus upon net differences in participation. If one is not certain whether participation in the arts is important for people. one is more likely to take the third perspective. which focusses on equality of opportunity but sees no virtue in stimulating demand.

In this section. we summarize the results of our analyses of the SPPA data on participation in selected artistic activities by Black. Hispanic. and white Americans./1 We organize our conclusions along the lines of the questions raised by the three perspectives noted above: gross differences in participation; net differences in participation; evidence bearing on the relative roles of differences in tastes and differences in exposure to barriers in accounting for the differences observed.

Because patterns of differences among groups vary among different kinds of artistic activities and because the SPPA did not ask people about many kinds of artistic activities. we can draw no general conclusions about differences in artistic participation per se. Thus. as we have throughout this report. we shall call attention to the kinds of activities to which specific conclusions do and do not apply.

The Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts represent the best resource available for investigating the questions with which this report is concerned. But no survey.

1/ We do not include Asian-Americans in this summary because the SPPA's information on this group was so limited.

especially one designed to address a great many different issues. can tell us everything we wish to know. In the final section. we set out an agenda of questions that remain. along with some suggestions about how such questions might be answered.

Do Rates of Participation Vary?

The answer to this question is unambiguous. Rates of participation in most of the activities about which the SPPAs asked vary among white. Black. and Hispanic respondents. White Americans participate at higher rates than Black or Hispanic Americans in most of these activities that involved attendance at museums. visual-art exhibitions. and live performing-arts events. Black Americans participate at higher rates than others. however. as members of jazz audiences.

Differences in rates of participation between whites. on the one hand. and Blacks and Hispanics on the other. were modest for two kinds of active performing-arts activities: playing a musical instrument on stage and singing. dancing. or acting in public. With respect to the former. however. differences between whites and Blacks were greater if only public performance of classical music or jazz was considered. Whites were also more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to participate in visual-art-producing activities like drawing. painting. or crafts. For most of these activities. rates of participation were somewhat higher for Hispanic than for Black respondents. although the differences between

white and Hispanic rates exceeded those between Hispanic and Black rates.

Except for reading imaginative literature. fewer than half of the people surveyed participated in any of the activities about which the "core" and "other activity" questions of the SPPA asked. With respect to all of the activities but reading. visiting art exhibits. visiting science and history museums. visiting historical monuments. and needlecrafts. fewer than 20 percent were active. Fewer than 5 percent of respondents attended opera or musical performances. or performed publicly on musical instruments or by singing. acting. or dancing.

Because relatively few people participated. especially in core activities. absolute differences in participation rates between groups were often small. But absolute differences between participation rates of whites and those of Blacks were .10 or more in both 1982 and 1985 for visiting art exhibitions. reading works of imaginative literature. visiting science or history museums. visiting historical monuments. attending arts and crafts fairs. and engaging in such needlecrafts as sewing or knitting. White rates exceeded Hispanic rates by this margin in both years for these same activities. except for visiting science or history museums and visiting art exhibits.

By contrast to the relatively small absolute margins of difference. ratios of white's to others' probabilities of participation were in many cases greater than two to one.

Blacks were less than half as likely as whites in both 1982 and 1985 to work in pottery or other craft media. or to attend classical music concerts. opera performances. musicals. plays. arts and crafts fairs. or ballet performances. Hispanic respondents were less than half as likely to attend plays in both years.

Thus there were persistent and substantial gaps in the extent to which white Americans. on the one hand. and Black and Hispanic Americans. on the other. reported participating in the arts about which the SPPA asked. Blacks and Hispanics were less likely to participate than whites in both performing-arts and visual-arts consumption activities; and in visual-art-making activities. Differences between groups were less for onstage performing activities. particularly when these included performance in popular genres. Differences were not restricted to traditional high-culture art forms. however. They also appeared for craft activities. literature reading. and visits to historical or scientific museums or exhibits.

Does Participation Vary Net of Sociodemographic Factors? That is. do Black. Hispanic. and white Americans who are similar with respect to such characteristics as gender. age. educational attainment. marital status. occupation. family income. and residence in an SMSA participate at different levels? Here the answer is more complicated.

If we take each of the core activities. one at a time. and control for socioeconomic and demographic effects. we

find different patterns for Black and Hispanic respondents. For most of the core activities in which whites participated significantly more than Blacks (all but jazz attendance and performing in public). between approximately 25 and 40 percent of the differences resulted from differences in sociodemographic position between the races. The remaining margins were statistically significant. but small compared to differences associated with educational attainment and other background factors. These differences indicate that some factor or factors make the probability that Black Americans participate in these activities significantly lower than the probability of participation for white Americans who are similar with respect to the socioeconomic and demographic factors for which we controlled. Nonetheless. policies that made Black Americans more equal to whites with respect to educational attainment. occupational status. and family income would diminish Black/white differences in rates of participation for every core activity but jazz attendance.

Sociodemographic differences between white and Hispanic respondents accounted for most of the gross differences between whites and Hispanics in attendance at classical music concerts. ballet. and art exhibits. With such factors controlled. white participation was significantly greater than Hispanic participation only for attendance at musical stage performances. plays and (in 1985 only) opera; and for reading imaginative literature and (in 1982 only) acting. singing or dancing on stage. In 1982, Hispanic respondents were

significantly more likely than comparable whites to attend ballet performances. Because the core activities for which significant differences persisted tended to be those that in the the United States are usually presented in the English language (musicals plays literature). we speculated that the high proportion of Hispanic Americans for whom Spanish is the native language may have played a role. If this speculation is correct. then Hispanic/white differences in core participation are largely attributable to socioeconomic and linguistic differences between whites and Hispanics. Thus policies that increased the educational attainment. occupational levels. and incomes of Hispanic Americans would eliminate much or all of the significant differences between Hispanics and whites in participation in most of the core activities. Moreover. differences in attendance at plays and musicals and differences in literature reading might be moderated by increasing the availability of such works in the Spanish language.

We also looked at net differences between groups in scores on five scales. developed with the use of factor analysis. representing the number of activities in which respondents participated. rather than the probability of participating in a specific activity. Drawing on a smaller sample of respondents who were asked a wider range of questions. these analyses looked at scores on four kinds of scales: participation as consumers at live performing-arts events (with and without jazz included); participation as consumers

of visual materials (art and history museum and exhibits and imaginative literature); participation as producers (onstage or backstage) of performing-arts events; participation as producers of visual arts and crafts.

Nearly all of the difference between Blacks and whites on the performing-arts consumption scale (and all of it if jazz is included on the scale) resulted from sociodemographic differences between members of the two racial groups. Once such factors were taken into account. no significant difference remained between comparable Blacks and whites in the number of kinds of performing-arts activities they reported attending. There was no significant difference between white and Black scores on the performing-arts consumption scale.

Black respondents scored significantly lower than whites on both the consumption and production scales for visual arts and literature. Moreover. only about 40 percent of these differences were attributable to the socioeconomic and demographic factors for which we controlled.

In other words. these analyses indicate that one cannot generalize about net Black/white differences in artistic participation. Blacks are more likely than whites to attend jazz concerts. and the margin only increases when sociodemographic differences between the races are taken into account. Blacks are no less likely than whites to participate in performing-arts activities as performers or by helping backstage. Blacks on average attend fewer kinds of perform-

ing-arts activities (of the ones about which the SPPA asked, not including jazz) than whites in general, but about the same number as whites who are comparable with respect to socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. By contrast, Black Americans participated in significantly fewer kinds of visually oriented arts activities than comparable whites, both as consumers and as producers.

Differences between white and Hispanic respondents can be described more succinctly. There were no significant differences between the scores of whites and Hispanics on either performing-arts or visual-arts production scales. Hispanic respondents scored significantly lower than whites on each of the consumption scales; but both of these differences resulted from differences between whites and Hispanics in socioeconomic standing and demographic characteristics. In other words, there are no significant differences in any of these scales between sociodemographically comparable white and Hispanic respondents.

Does Demand for Artistic Participation Vary?

This question is the hardest to address with the resources provided by the SPPAs, and we have reached no definitive conclusions. The best we can do is to hold the data up like so many prisms and report the results, inconclusive as they are, from a variety of angles.

The SPPAs asked a subsample of respondents directly whether they liked a wide range of musical genres. Within each group -- Blacks, Hispanics, and whites -- responses

were very stable between 1982 and 1985. White and Hispanic tastes for the genres included were quite similar. Black respondents' tastes were more different. especially from those of white respondents. although. like Hispanics and whites. Blacks tended to prefer commercial popular genres to most other kinds of music. Larger proportions of whites and Hispanics liked country western. rock and easy listening music than any other kind of music whereas Black respondents were most likely to choose hymns/gospel music and soul/-blues/rhythm and blues. and jazz. Those genres favored by whites and Hispanics ranked fourth. fifth. and sixth among Black respondents. well ahead of the seven other genres about which the survey asked. Moreover. substantial minorities of whites and Hispanics enjoyed gospel. rhythm and blues. and jazz. Such genres as bluegrass. barbershop. and opera were distinctly unpopular among all three groups. Taken together. the results demonstrate strong similarity of tastes between whites and Hispanics. and patterns of musical taste for whites and Blacks that. although different. involve differing intensities of participation in the same commercial popular musical forms rather than sharply opposed or segmented preferences.

Looking more closely at the four kinds of music related to the SPPA core participation items (classical music. opera. show tunes. and jazz). we see that Black/white differences in taste for classical music mirrored differences in Black and white rates of attendance at classical concerts.

By contrast. the proportion of Hispanic respondents who said they enjoyed classical music was close to that of whites in 1982 and greater in 1985. Taken together with the finding that Hispanics were about as likely to attend classical concerts as sociodemographically comparable white respondents. this pattern suggests that Hispanics would attend classical music performances at the same rates as whites if they had the resources with which to do so.

Similarly. Black/white differences with respect to opera. show tunes. and jazz are comparable to differences between Blacks and whites in attendance at operas. musicals. and jazz performances. So were Hispanic/white differences for opera and show tunes in 1982, but not in 1985, when differences in attendance far exceeded differences in taste. Hispanic respondents were more likely than whites to report liking jazz in both years. but less likely to report attending jazz concerts. Taken together. these results again suggest that Hispanic/white disparities in attendance at these activities reflect socioeconomic barriers rather than differences in taste; whereas Black/white differences would appear. from these data. to be largely accounted for by differences in taste alone.

Note. however. that this conclusion would conflict with results of analyses predicting probabilities of participation in the core attendance activities (other than jazz). which showed that between 25 and 40 percent of Black/white differences were accounted for by differences between Blacks

and whites in socioeconomic and demographic factors. as was approximately 75 percent of the Black/white difference in the performing-arts consumption scale (excluding jazz). In other words. it seems likely that some portion of differences in taste are themselves the result of socioeconomic inequality. Consistent with this interpretation. once sociodemographic factors are taken into account. differences in musical taste or in artistic socialization explain little of the intergroup variation that remains.

The SPPAs also asked respondents directly if they wanted to participate in the seven core attendance activities more than they had in the previous year. Respondents from all groups who had participated in a given activity in the previous year were much more likely than those who had not to wish that they had done so more. And respondents who had not participated were more likely to wish that they had if they were members of groups that participated at relatively high rates. For most activities. the proportion of people who did not participate but said that they wanted to exceeded the proportion that actually participated.

What this implies is that if all reported barriers to attendance were removed -- that is. if everyone who reported wanting to participate but did not joined the ranks of attenders -- the absolute differences in probabilities of attendance at core participation activities between members of different groups would increase. The margin between Black attendance at jazz concerts and attendance by whites

and Hispanics would become greater. as would the margin between white attendance at classical concerts. operas. musicals. plays. ballet performances. and art exhibitions and that of Blacks and Hispanics. For many activities. however. the large increase in the proportions attending in each group would reduce the ratios of probability of participation between groups.

We caution against taking this finding too seriously for several reasons. First. we are not sure what respondents meant when they said they wanted to attend more than they did. Second. we suspect that respondents factored in the cost of attendance in deciding whether they wished to do something they had not done. so that respondents facing socioeconomic barriers would have been less likely to report "wanting" to attend an event than more well-to-do respondents whose taste for the activity in question was similar to theirs. Finally. we suspect that many barriers to participation work by reducing demand for participation in such activities. rather than by keeping people from satisfying demand.

Indeed. other analyses. including the results on Hispanic musical tastes mentioned above. casts doubt upon the degree to which whites do value the SPPA core arts more highly than do Blacks or Hispanics. Differences in the extent to which whites. on the one hand. and Blacks and Hispanics. on the other. watch the core attendance activities (other than jazz) on television are not so great as dif-

ferences in the extent of live participation. This suggests that when cost is not a factor (because most Americans have access to televised arts programs). intergroup rates of participation are more comparable than when participation is more costly and time-consuming.

Moreover. parents of Hispanic and Black Americans appeared to value certain kinds of artistic socialization even more highly than comparable white parents. When age, gender. and parents' educational attainment are controlled. Hispanic and Black respondents reported significantly (albeit modestly) higher scores in a home socialization scale comprising parental encouragement to read. being taken to museums. exposure to classical music while growing up. and being taken to performing-arts events.

Taken individually. the results of the analyses described in this section point in somewhat different directions. Taken together they suggest that the issue of motivation is extremely complex. On the one hand. participation in the artistic activities for which intergroup differences appear is not. like education. something that everyone clearly desires. For example. eliminating all barriers to attendance at jazz concerts or ballet or opera performances (by providing free vouchers. transportation. and baby-sitting). would seem unlikely to eliminate Black/white differences in rates of attendance. On the other hand. it would be simplistic. and at odds with many of our other findings. to suggest that Blacks and Hispanics attend cer-

tain activities less than whites simply because they like them less. Rather differences in participation rates appear to result in part from differences in socioeconomic opportunity. in part from differences in taste. and in part from the interaction of these two factors.

Summary Conclusions

1. Rates of participation in the activities about which the SPPA asked differ by race and ethnicity. White rates are greatest for almost all these activities (with the notable exception of those associated with jazz. for which Black rates are greatest). In general. differences are greater for attendance at cultural institutions and reading than for arts viewing on television. socialization into the arts through home activities and (for Blacks) formal classes and lessons. participation in most art-producing activities. and (for Hispanics) musical tastes. For most activities. absolute differences are relatively small (with minorities of any group participating). although ratios of white to other rates are often as high as two to one.

2. Black Americans participate somewhat less than sociodemographically comparable white Americans in most of the core activities. but most of these net differences are small. Net differences between Blacks and whites are more marked for visually oriented than for performing-arts activities. Black Americans are significantly more likely than comparable whites to attend jazz concerts.

3. Hispanic Americans participate somewhat less in some core activities. especially those usually presented in the English language. than comparable whites. In general. however. Hispanic Americans participate at rates similar to those of socioeconomically comparable white Americans.

4. Differences in participation associated with race are very small compared to those associated with educational attainment and are usually exceeded by those associated with income. occupational prestige. and gender. The principle barriers to participation for Blacks and. especially. Hispanics. are socioeconomic. These barriers reduce minority participation by influencing demand for the arts and by making it difficult for less well off Americans to satisfy their demand.

5. Measurable differences in taste or in socialization into the arts. other than those associated with differences in socioeconomic standing. play a small role. at most. in explaining the observed differences in participation between Black. Hispanic. and white Americans. Much of the observed differences in taste. demand or socialization appears to result from socioeconomic differences between these groups.

6. Intergroup differences in participation in most of the activities about which the SPPA asked are smaller for younger than for older respondents. Most of this apparent decline in the participation gap is the result of increases in socioeconomic resources. especially years of schooling. of Black and Hispanic respondents.

Further Research

We have emphasized throughout this report that one cannot generalize meaningfully about "artistic participation." Patterns of differences between whites, on the one hand, and Blacks and Hispanics, on the other, vary among activities.

The SPPA questions focussed upon categories of participation that a pre-test indicated were widely understood by all or most people interviewed. The requirements of a national survey tended to exclude such forms as mariachi music or clog dancing that are unfamiliar to most Americans, including many forms with roots in specific American ethnic or racial communities. The questions also tended to focus on consumption activities associated with nonprofit cultural institutions rather than on the most widely consumed forms of popular culture. We suspect that there are many activities for which, like jazz, white participation is lower than that of Black Americans. Consequently, we would not generalize the findings of this report beyond the specific kinds of activities that the SPPA considered. Because the SPPA items cover a broad range of activities, including ones with which public policy has been particularly concerned, we do not regard this as a serious problem given the purposes of this report. But it does mean that it would be a mistake to treat this as a full treatment of all aspects of the artistic participation of Black, Hispanic and white Americans.

Even within the scope of artistic participation defined by the SPPA. this report could not address a number of questions that are of substantial interest. The limitations we describe below are natural ones for a national survey that was not designed specifically to address racial and ethnic differences in participation. and some may be unavoidable given the resources available for this kind of research. Nonetheless. without questioning the importance of what the SPPAs have already accomplished. it may be useful to sketch a few tasks that remain.

More fine-grained ethnic categories: Each of the groups we examined is heterogeneous. The SPPA data did not permit close analysis of participation by ethnic subgroups. in part because the number of Hispanic respondents (other than Mexican-Americans) was relatively small. in part because of the way in which ethnic background was coded on the SPPA. In particular. it is important from the standpoint of public policy to distinguish among the ethnic groups that constitute the Hispanic and Asian categories; between native-born and immigrant (e.g., West Indian) Black Americans; and between Native Americans and other respondents. A design that stratified the sample on ethnicity and oversampled these groups relative their percentage of the population. and a coding scheme that distinguished more clearly among groups would be helpful in this respect.

The effects of region: In order to mask the identity of respondents. the Census Bureau did not include locational

data on the SPPA files. Broad regional classifications would permit investigation of regional differences (which may interact with race or ethnicity) without breaching confidentiality.

The effects of native language: Especially for those groups for which recent immigration rates have been relatively high (Hispanics and Asians). it seems important to be able to assess the impact of native language on participation in activities relying on the spoken or written word.

Variation by race and ethnicity within participation categories: Even if we were to have found no differences in the rates of participation of Black. Hispanic. and white Americans in the activities that the SPPA described. we could not conclude that these groups participated in the the same way. Do Blacks. Hispanics and whites who attend theatre. for example. see the same kind of plays at the same kind of venues? If attenders vary by race or ethnic origin in the kinds of activities they prefer. we might be able to assess the extent to which different rates of participation result from the undersupply of the kinds of activity preferred by members of the groups that participate less. Such questions could perhaps best be addressed in local area surveys that could ask respondents about attendance at specific events or specific institutions. We suspect that such questions would reveal greater intergroup diversity than questions phrased in more general terms.

Interactions among gender. education. occupation. artistic socialization. and race or ethnicity. We found some suggestive evidence of differences in the effects of these factors on participation by members of different groups. but could explore them only superficially due to the relatively small number of Black. Hispanic. and especially Asian respondents. Particularly with respect to activities in which relatively few people participate. cell sizes (e.g., for college-educated. Hispanic opera attenders) quickly become very small. A research design that permitted oversampling of minority respondents (relative their share of the population) would alleviate this problem to some degree. Change over time in minority participation. Although one can make rough inferences about changing patterns on the basis of cohort analysis. as we have attempted to do in this report. confident conclusions require data collected over a wide range of time. The 1982 and 1985 SPPAs represent an excellent first step in this process. There can be no substitute for the routine collection of comparable data at regular intervals.

Participation in more specialized artistic forms: How widespread is participation in the activities about which the SPPA could not ask because they were not sufficiently familiar to the average American? Some of these activities. e.g. reggae music or Balkan folk dance. might be characterized by racially or ethnically homogeneous audiences. even though the proportion of persons in the relevant ethnic groups who

participate is very low. Such art forms may add a great deal to our national cultures and to specific artistic subcultures even if they are participated in by too few persons to catch in a national sample survey. Regional or SMSA-based surveys might be able to explore the distribution of participation in such activities more effectively.

Participation in popular culture. The one SPPA question that provided information about taste for large-scale commercial popular-culture genres. the music preference question. revealed patterns of racial and ethnic cleavage and convergence that were not apparent in responses about the other activities about which the survey asked. Because much. probably most. of the arts that Americans consume is provided by the national. popular-culture industries. a comprehensive analysis of differences in artistic participation would require attention to participation in popular culture broadly defined.

The foregoing is a wish list and. as such. is unrestricted by the costs. multiple priorities. and tradeoffs that constrain actual research decisions. Some of the suggestions offered above will be impractical. while others may not. In conclusion. we offer the following recommendations:

1. That information on region of residence be included in the SPPA data file.

2. That information on native language be collected and included in the SPPA data file.

3. That the Arts Endowment explore the possibility of a design for the SPPA that oversamples Black. Hispanic. Asian. and Native American respondents relative their share of the population.

4. That ethnicity codes comparable to those provided in the Census of Population. including multiple ethnic origins. be collected for the SPPA.

5. That the Arts Endowment or other research sponsors explore the possibility of supporting several comparable local surveys in several regions of participation in the arts that include questions about attendance in specific events or at specific institutions.

Appendix Table 2-1: Z Scores for Musical Tastes by Racial/Ethnic Group and Year

	Whites		Blacks		Hispanics	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Classical	-0.14	-0.44	-0.44	-0.68	0.18	0.13
Opera	-1.55	-1.68	-0.96	-0.92	-1.36	-1.33
Show tunes	-0.43	-0.47	-0.62	-0.70	-0.59	-0.43
Jazz	-0.51	-0.20	0.95	1.27	0.26	0.84
Soul/blues	-0.62	-0.30	1.87	1.90	0.42	0.37
Big band	0.31	0.20	-0.30	-0.32	0.05	-0.55
C&W	2.38	1.95	0.00	-0.05	2.00	1.63
Bluegrass	-0.23	-0.41	-0.99	-1.10	-1.05	-0.94
Rock	0.39	0.82	0.26	0.16	1.09	1.49
Easy listening	1.55	1.74	0.02	0.63	1.31	1.17
Folk	-0.25	-0.42	-0.80	-0.64	-0.40	-0.66
Barbershop	-1.09	-1.20	-1.01	-1.10	-1.39	-1.51
Hymns/gospel	0.21	0.43	2.04	1.58	-0.52	-0.20

Appendix Table 2-2: Percentages Participating in Core Activities by Respondents who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1982 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz			Classical		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	5.64	29.36	5.21	6.56	31.68	4.83
(N)	(2733)	(550)		(2421)	(865)	
B	10.70	28.39	2.65	3.66	12.92	3.53
(N)	(269)	(97)		(308)	(58)	
H	4.41	4.66	1.06	1.76	20.49	11.64
(N)	(170)	(33)		(160)	(43)	
W/B odds	0.53	1.03		1.79	2.45	
W/H odds	1.28	6.30		3.73	1.55	

Core Item:	Opera			Musical Theatre		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.39	11.22	8.07	14.94	42.46	2.84
(N)	(2863)	(423)		(2584)	(694)	
B	0.32	2.83	8.84	5.17	27.22	5.26
(N)	(333)	(33)		(303)	(63)	
H	0.48	9.57	19.93	7.68	35.58	4.63
(N)	(183)	(20)		(167)	(36)	
W/B odds	4.34	3.96		2.89	1.56	
W/H odds	2.90	1.17		1.95	1.19	

Core Item:	Plays			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.27	25.98	3.57	2.49	16.03	6.44
(N)	(2375)	(909)		(2712)	(566)	
B	1.83	18.14	9.91	0.51	2.87	5.63
(N)	(302)	(64)		(327)	(38)	
H	4.37	8.37	1.92	0.49	17.14	34.98
(N)	(173)	(30)		(172)	(31)	
W/B Odds	3.97	1.43		4.88	5.59	
W/H Odds	1.66	3.10		5.08	0.94	

Core Item:	Art		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.13	47.93	2.97
(N)	(2492)	(781)	
B	9.14	26.64	2.91
(N)	(299)	(67)	
H	11.16	44.87	4.02
(N)	(169)	(33)	
W/B Odds	1.76	1.80	
W/H Odds	1.45	1.07	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. "Yes" refers to respondents who watched relevant television programs, "No" to those who did not. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who watched programs to those who did not. W/B Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for Blacks. W/H Odds= probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2-3: Percentage Participating in Core Activities by Respondents who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz			Classical		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	6.05	25.59	4.23	6.00	34.55	5.76
(N)	(1443)	(257)		(1263)	(446)	
B	2.81	34.27	12.19	4.52	34.25	7.58
(N)	(116)	(69)		(146)	(41)	
H	2.98	24.86	8.34	2.32	28.98	12.49
(N)	(105)	(18)		(101)	(23)	
W/B odds	2.15	.75		1.33	1.01	
W/H odds	2.03	1.03		2.59	1.19	

Core Item:	Opera			Musical Theatre		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.33	12.02	9.04	13.44	42.07	3.13
(N)	(1474)	(234)		(1394)	(313)	
B	0.00	11.68	NA	4.89	30.96	6.33
(N)	(169)	(18)		(151)	(35)	
H	0.82	6.41	7.82	4.86	28.07	5.78
(N)	(108)	(15)		(104)	(20)	
W/B odds	NA	1.03		2.75	1.36	
W/H odds	1.62	1.88		2.77	1.50	

Core Item:	Plays			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	6.65	28.16	4.23	2.97	16.99	5.72
(N)	(1299)	(406)		(1431)	(276)	
B	4.00	14.30	3.58	0.00	14.30	NA
(N)	(150)	(36)		(155)	(32)	
H	3.97	23.41	5.90	1.97	23.34	11.85
(N)	(105)	(18)		(102)	(21)	
W/B Odds	1.66	1.97		NA	1.19	
W/H Odds	1.68	1.20		1.51	0.72	

Core Item:	Art		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.49	44.09	2.67
(N)	(1242)	(461)	
B	11.04	18.96	1.72
(N)	(143)	(44)	
H	8.11	56.30	6.94
(N)	(101)	(23)	
W/B Odds	1.49	2.33	
W/H Odds	2.03	0.78	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. "Yes" refers to respondents who watched relevant television programs, "No" to those who did not. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who watched programs to those who did not. W/B Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for Blacks. W/H Odds= probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2-4: Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1982 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz Attendance			Jazz Attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	4.70	13.22	2.81	6.37	18.56	2.91
(N)	(2283)	(2301)		(3593)	(991)	
B	8.76	33.96	3.87	14.87	34.47	2.32
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	9.18	11.23	1.22	7.69	29.36	3.82
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/B odds	0.54	0.39		0.43	0.54	
W/H odds	0.51	1.18		0.83	0.63	

Core Item:	Classical Attendance			Classical Attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.58	21.45	2.83	10.53	29.34	2.79
(N)	(2287)	(2301)		(3597)	(991)	
B	3.98	11.62	2.92	4.17	18.09	4.34
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	4.42	12.66	2.86	3.79	31.32	8.26
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/B odds	1.90	1.85		2.53	1.62	
W/H odds	1.71	1.69		2.78	0.94	

Core Item:	Opera			Opera		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	2.00	3.81	1.91	2.17	5.64	2.60
(N)	(2286)	(2301)		(3597)	(990)	
B	0.21	1.79	8.52	0.44	2.42	5.50
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	1.42	1.44	1.01	0.54	10.39	19.24
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/B Odds	9.52	2.13		4.93	2.33	
W/H Odds	1.41	2.65		4.02	0.54	

Core Item:	Musical			Musical		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	13.65	27.50	2.01	15.91	37.89	2.38
(N)	(2287)	(2302)		(3598)	(991)	
B	5.05	18.31	3.63	6.75	24.38	3.61
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	6.25	14.54	2.33	5.23	37.20	7.11
N	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/B Odds	2.70	1.50		2.36	1.55	
W/H Odds	2.18	1.89		3.04	1.02	

Appendix Table 2-4 (con.)

Core Item:	Musical			Plays		
Lesson:	Acting			Acting		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	18.01	44.53	2.47	11.34	29.55	2.61
(N)	(4139)	(450)		(4138)	(449)	
B	9.52	22.72	2.39	4.24	14.69	3.46
(N)	(481)	(32)		(481)	(32)	
H	7.36	17.55	2.38	3.22	12.51	3.89
(N)	(282)	(23)		(282)	(23)	
W/B Odds	1.89	1.96		2.67	2.01	
W/H Odds	2.45	2.54		3.52	2.36	

Core Item:	Art Exhibits			Art Exhibits		
Lesson:	Art			Crafts		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	15.39	45.43	2.95	16.28	36.42	2.24
(N)	(3441)	(1144)		(3065)	(1519)	
B	9.37	33.22	3.55	6.70	35.92	5.36
(N)	(426)	(88)		(396)	(118)	
H	12.54	35.10	2.80	12.11	33.56	2.77
(N)	(256)	(49)		(246)	(59)	
W/B Odds	1.64	1.37		2.43	1.01	
W/H Odds	1.25	1.29		1.34	1.09	

Core Item:	Art Exhibits			Ballet		
Lesson:	Art Appreciation			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.11	49.50	3.07	2.65	22.89	8.64
(N)	(3647)	(938)		(4215)	(374)	
B	9.53	36.39	3.82	1.23	15.14	12.31
(N)	(437)	(77)		(493)	(21)	
H	12.16	50.52	4.15	2.19	32.44	14.81
(N)	(272)	(33)		(294)	(11)	
W/B Odds	1.69	1.36		2.15	1.51	
W/H Odds	1.32	0.98		1.21	0.71	

Core Item:	Reading Literature		
Lesson:	Creative Writing		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	55.82	84.38	1.51
(N)	(3694)	(879)	
B	37.18	82.59	2.22
(N)	(445)	(68)	
H	32.69	60.82	1.86
(N)	(266)	(37)	
W/B Odds	1.50	1.02	
W/H Odds	1.71	1.39	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who have taken lessons/probability for those who have not. W/B Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for Blacks. W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2-5: Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz Attendance			Jazz Attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	5.45	15.52	2.85	7.38	22.21	3.00
(N)	(928)	(993)		(1482)	(439)	
B	8.12	16.99	2.09	7.16	32.15	4.49
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	0.57	14.56	25.54	2.55	22.72	8.91
(N)	(105)	(37)		(129)	(13)	
W/B odds	0.67	0.93		1.03	0.69	
W/H odds	9.56	1.07		2.89	0.98	

Core Item:	Classical Attendance			Classical Attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.34	24.19	3.30	10.88	34.18	3.14
(N)	(929)	(992)		(1482)	(439)	
B	2.39	9.29	3.89	3.90	10.09	2.59
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	1.68	31.60	18.81	7.78	22.91	2.94
(N)	(106)	(37)		(130)	(13)	
W/B odds	3.07	2.60		2.79	3.39	
W/H odds	4.37	0.77		1.40	1.49	

Core Item:	Opera			Opera		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.71	4.51	2.64	2.23	6.43	2.88
(N)	(928)	(992)		(1481)	(439)	
B	0.00	3.56	NA	0.00	7.76	NA
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	0.00	2.24	NA	0.58	0.00	0.00
(N)	(105)	(37)		(129)	(13)	
W/B Odds	NA	1.27		NA	0.85	
W/H Odds	NA	2.01		3.84	NA	

Core Item:	Musical			Musical		
Lesson:	Music			Music Appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	10.80	26.25	2.43	14.39	34.17	2.37
(N)	(929)	(991)		(1481)	(439)	
B	7.59	11.69	1.54	6.36	22.56	3.55
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	3.46	18.92	5.47	5.48	29.60	5.40
(N)	(106)	(37)		(130)	(13)	
W/B Odds	1.42	2.25		2.26	1.51	
W/H Odds	3.12	1.39		2.63	1.15	

Appendix Table 2-5 (con.)

Core Item:	Musical			Plays		
Lesson:	Acting			Acting		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	15.84	42.24	2.67	11.57	33.56	2.90
(N)	(1714)	(206)		(1715)	(207)	
B	8.65	14.04	1.62	4.41	15.79	3.58
(N)	(182)	(17)		(181)	(17)	
H	6.58	18.93	2.88	6.58	0.00	0.00
(N)	(133)	(10)		(133)	(10)	
W/B Odds	1.83	3.01		2.62	2.13	
W/H Odds	2.41	2.23		1.76	NA	

Core Item:	Art Exhibits			Art Exhibits		
Lesson:	Art			Crafts		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.26	46.46	2.86	10.57	37.53	3.55
(N)	(1383)	(538)		(1183)	(738)	
B	4.25	30.71	7.23	6.40	14.93	2.33
(N)	(161)	(38)		(140)	(59)	
H	17.91	36.89	2.06	19.05	25.46	1.34
(N)	(123)	(20)		(116)	(27)	
W/B Odds	3.83	1.51		1.65	2.51	
W/H Odds	0.91	1.26		0.55	1.47	

Core Item:	Art Exhibits			Ballet		
Lesson:	Art Appreciation			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.37	54.98	3.36	3.56	18.40	5.17
(N)	(1492)	(429)		(1731)	(191)	
B	4.93	28.00	5.68	1.14	14.38	12.61
(N)	(166)	(33)		(193)	(6)	
H	18.63	39.15	2.10	2.95	0.00	0.00
(N)	(133)	(10)		(137)	(6)	
W/B Odds	3.32	1.96		3.12	1.28	
W/H Odds	0.88	1.40		1.21	NA	

Core Item:	Reading Literature		
Lesson:	Creative Writing		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	53.45	90.37	1.69
(N)	(1508)	(410)	
B	38.55	62.99	1.62
(N)	(173)	(25)	
H	36.04	89.18	2.47
(N)	(138)	(5)	
W/B Odds	1.39	1.43	
W/H Odds	1.48	1.01	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who have taken lessons/probability for those who have not. W/B Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for Blacks. W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 3-1: Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1982 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), Blacks (B) and Hispanics (H)

	Attend jazz concerts			Attend classical concerts			Attend opera		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
WOMEN									
b	.101	-.451	-.026	.650	.226	.066	.444	.521	1.573
se	.065	.158	.252	.057	.228	.260	.107	.518	.558
sig	NS	a	NS	d	NS	NS	d	NS	a
SMSA									
b	.373	.658	-.318	.107	.602	.453	.666	.357	-.387
se	.077	.207	.341	.062	.310	.453	.139	.686	.702
sig	d	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
AGE									
b	-.028	-.041	-.028	.016	.018	.003	.031	-.012	.013
se	.003	.007	.012	.002	.008	.010	.003	.022	.019
sig	d	d	a	d	a	NSdc	NS	NS	
EDUC									
b	.216	.235	.083	.335	.274	.191	.250	.385	.427
se	.015	.038	.046	.012	.048	.049	.022	.120	.101
sig	d	d	NS	d	d	c	d	a	d
INC									
b	.073	.002	.071	.114	.037	.142	.200	.325	.143
se	.021	.065	.095	.018	.088	.095	.032	.158	.163
sig	b	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	d	a	NS
OCC									
b	.184	.422	.838	.252	.546	.463	.392	.519	.063
se	.072	.178	.282	.061	.258	.287	.121	.628	.512
sig	a	a	a	d	a	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.810	.236	.010	.467	.736	.602	.773	.031	.753
se	.073	.172	.290	.067	.245	.293	.124	.550	.536
sig	d	NS	NS	d	a	a	d	NS	NS
INT	-4.98	-3.66	-2.52	-7.89	-7.93	-5.83	-9.85	-10.58	-10.72

Appendix Table 3-1 (con.)

	Attend musical			Attend play			Attend ballet		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
WOMEN									
b	.583	-.139	.510	.581	-.050	-.175	1.101	.960	1.202
se	.049	.186	.235	.058	.240	.316	.097	.477	.394
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS	d	a	a
SMSA									
b	.482	.659	.737	.202	1.266	.226	.617	1.155	8.073
se	.055	.258	.427	.064	.423	.539	.114	.705	*
sig	d	a	NS	a	a	NS	d	NS	*
AGE									
b	.009	.001	-.001	.013	.017	.009	.010	-.032	.019
se	.002	.007	.009	.002	.009	.012	.003	.020	.014
sig	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	b	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.241	.219	.189	.288	.211	.275	.283	.462	.380
se	.010	.041	.044	.012	.051	.064	.019	.106	.077
sig	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d
INC									
b	.189	.262	.197	.187	.256	.146	.112	.032	.211
se	.016	.068	.086	.018	.086	.111	.028	.167	.131
sig	d	c	a	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.400	.314	.644	.459	.310	.738	.471	-.088	.769
se	.053	.214	.255	.063	.277	.351	.102	.493	.399
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.271	.184	.360	.504	.582	.145	.525	.668	.645
se	.059	.206	.263	.063	.264	.366	.104	.458	.415
sig	d	NS	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
INT	-6.25	-6.02	-5.91	-7.54	-7.92	-7.22	-9.12	-10.94	-18.09

Appendix Table 3-1 (con.)

	Visit art museum or gallery			Perform: Play musical instrument			Perform: Act, sing, or dance		
	W	B	H	W	B	H-	W	B	C
WOMEN									
b	.436	-.157	.101	.011	.046	.237	.300	.069	.295
se	.047	.177	.202	.091	.293	.424	.086	.248	.420
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	b	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.245	1.364	-.071	-.006	-.522	8.080	-.061	-.190	7.959
se	.051	.297	.298	.099	.304	*	.092	.274	*
sig	d	d	NS	NS	NS	*	NS	NS	*
AGE									
b	.001	-.000	-.012	-.011	-.001	-.018	-.020	-.016	-.020
se	.002	.007	.009	.003	.011	.018	.003	.010	.018
sig	NS	NS	NS	b	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.320	.279	.279	.106	.091	.001	.112	.084	-.072
se	.011	.040	.042	.019	.057	.067	.019	.050	.065
sig	d	d	d	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
INC									
b	.115	.152	.226	-.089	.072	-.145	-.062	.042	.202
se	.015	.068	.076	.033	.117	.199	.030	.100	.166
sig	d	a	a	a	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.255	.710	.444	-.055	.161	.657	.209	.403	.906
se	.050	.197	.219	.103	.343	.488	.095	.282	.488
sig	d	b	a	NS	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.415	.194	.019	.418	.515	.018	.245	.275	.444
se	.056	.193	.234	.105	.325	.478	.099	.273	.473
sig	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
INT	-6.29	-7.07	-5.02	-3.96	-4.40	-10.98	-3.80	-3.58	-10.94

Appendix Table 3-1 (con.)

Read novels, short stories, poems, or plays

	W	B	H
WOMEN			
b	.889	.552	.496
se	.041	.123	.156
sig	d	d	a
SMSA			
b	.085	.310	-.120
se	.043	.137	.219
sig	a	a	NS
AGE			
b	.002	-.014	-.004
se	.001	.004	.006
sig	NS	a	NS
EDUC			
b	.288	.204	.222
se	.009	.026	.028
sig	d	d	d
INC			
b	.079	.126	.034
se	.015	.053	.065
sig	d	a	NS
OCC			
b	.225	.711	.411
se	.047	.146	.183
sig	d	d	a
MARIT			
b	.245	.261	.029
se	.052	.134	.183
sig	d	NS	NS
INT	-4.03	-3.09	-3.15

NOTES: b is the unstandardized logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .01, c=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant. Variables are defined in the text. The coefficients and standard errors for INC are multiplied by 10,000 for purposes of display. *=The program does not compute reliable standard errors and significance tests for coefficients of this magnitude.

Appendix Table 3-2: Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1985 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), Blacks (B) and Hispanics (H)

	Attend jazz concerts			Attend classical concerts			Attend opera		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
WOMEN									
b	.143	-.491	-.161	.542	.336	.276	.473	.156	-1.415
se	.072	.182	.316	.064	.256	.315	.125	.501	1.262
sig	a	a	NS	c	NS	NS	c	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.359	.358	-.388	.165	.090	.269	.099	8.227	7.111
se	.088	.232	.403	.072	.331	.474	.147	*	*
sig	c	NS	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	*	*
AGE									
b	-.024	-.034	-.010	.016	.024	.012	.019	.029	-.032
se	.003	.008	.014	.002	.009	.012	.004	.016	.054
sig	c	c	NS	c	a	NS	c	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.265	.235	.175	.342	.280	.369	.320	.361	.214
se	.017	.043	.059	.014	.051	.065	.027	.103	.215
sig	c	c	a	c	c	c	c	b	NS
INC									
b	.081	.230	-.014	.103	.268	.100	.133	.031	.470
se	.021	.061	.112	.018	.079	.102	.034	.169	.267
sig	c	b	NS	c	b	NS	c	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.193	-.340	.429	.299	.068	-.592	.549	.345	7.805
se	.082	.214	.349	.071	.280	.354	.150	.561	*
sig	a	NS	NS	c	NS	NS	b	NS	*
MARIT									
b	.548	.132	.040	.477	.816	.337	.431	.819	-.155
se	.083	.200	.348	.076	.277	.350	.147	.536	1.135
sig	c	NS	NS	c	a	NS	a	NS	NS
INT	-5.72	-3.97	-4.12	-8.08	-8.31	-7.97	-9.92	-18.67	-21.56

Appendix Table 3-2 (con.)

	Attend musical			Attend play			Attend ballet		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
WOMEN									
b	.513	.560	.186	.436	.285	.189	.980	.198	-.161
se	.057	.233	.284	.065	.269	.325	.105	.416	.429
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.593	.836	-.021	.402	.594	.111	.233	8.544	-.084
se	.067	.353	.417	.077	.393	.477	.120	*	.600
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	NS	*	NS
AGE									
b	.007	.014	.023	.009	.009	.021	.004	.006	-.002
se	.002	.008	.011	.002	.010	.012	.003	.014	.019
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.217	.255	.394	.294	.372	.251	.318	.259	.205
se	.012	.046	.060	.014	.059	.061	.022	.082	.082
sig	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	a	a
INC									
b	.162	.188	.089	.117	.226	.126	.125	.016	.170
se	.016	.072	.093	.018	.083	.105	.027	.143	.133
sig	d	a	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.377	.492	.448	.414	-.180	-.080	.287	.744	.311
se	.063	.242	.308	.073	.296	.363	.115	.453	.479
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.244	.458	-.071	.415	.712	.304	.445	-.726	.106
se	.069	.242	.323	.077	.290	.363	.115	.482	.477
sig	a	NS	NS	d	a	NS	c	NS	NS
INT	-6.11	-7.88	-8.35	-7.45	-9.25	-6.97	-8.94	-15.93	-6.12

Appendix Table 3-2 (con.)

	Visit art museum or gallery			Perform: Play musical instrument			Perform: Act, sing, or dance		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
WOMEN									
b	.383	.276	.141	-.147	.051	-1.185	.240	.129	-.258
se	.052	.203	.203	.124	.433	.604	.103	.326	.471
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	a	a	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.495	.362	-.083	-.483	.154	-.125	-.278	.020	8.004
se	.060	.269	.286	.131	.533	.687	.109	.396	*
sig	d	NS	NS	b	NS	NS	a	NS	*
AGE									
b	-.001	-.007	.007	-.023	-.042	-.026	-.016	.003	-.066
se	.002	.008	.008	.005	.020	.026	.004	.012	.029
sig	NS	NS	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	a
EDUC									
b	.312	.272	.155	.179	.058	.153	.143	.101	-.037
se	.012	.044	.037	.028	.095	.097	.022	.064	.084
sig	d	d	d	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
INC									
b	.097	.208	.114	.090	.017	.019	-.056	.084	-.031
se	.015	.065	.072	.039	.154	.180	.032	.112	.173
sig	d	a	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.257	.385	.688	.412	.743	.058	.348	.413	.820
se	.058	.217	.224	.143	.466	.585	.117	.360	.537
sig	d	NS	a	a	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.297	.252	.125	.155	-.104	.149	.101	.631	.074
se	.063	.218	.228	.143	.471	.571	.120	.356	.532
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
INT	-6.23	-6.34	-3.98	-4.64	-3.58	-4.26	-4.35	-5.33	-9.10

Appendix Table 3-2 (con.)

	Read novels, short stories, poems, or plays		
	W	B	H
WOMEN			
b	.912	.362	.595
se	.046	.127	.171
sig	d	a	b
SMSA			
b	.122	.797	.119
se	.048	.155	.239
sig	a	d	NS
AGE			
b	.002	-.007	.013
se	.001	.004	.007
sig	NS	NS	a
EDUC			
b	.240	.171	.187
se	.010	.026	.029
sig	d	d	d
INC			
b	.091	.069	.102
se	.015	.050	.066
sig	c	NS	NS
OCC			
b	.290	.648	.776
se	.052	.152	.193
sig	d	d	c
MARIT			
b	.101	.031	.234
se	.057	.143	.193
sig	NS	NS	NS
INT	-3.60	-3.10	-3.72

NOTES: b is the unstandardized logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .01, c=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant. Variables are defined in the text. The coefficients and standard errors for INC are multiplied by 10,000 for purposes of display. *=Program does not compute reliable standard errors or significance statistics when regression coefficients are this high.

Appendix Table 4-1: Weighted Percentages of Respondents who Wished to Attend Jazz Music Performances More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Tickets sold out	3.96	4.77	14.87	1.18	0.80	0.00
Cost	31.35	59.05	34.14	25.62	45.05	39.94
Not available	29.07	16.66	31.52	22.43	12.67	14.06
Child care	3.80	8.90	12.87	7.94	8.26	11.49
Too far to go	13.98	2.02	20.04	15.59	7.00	12.95
Transportation	7.28	10.91	28.47	5.66	13.75	6.35
Fear crime	0.66	0.00	0.00	2.89	5.17	0.00
Lacks motivation	8.33	6.11	14.08	13.85	9.53	11.12
Too little time	42.97	37.83	29.52	41.39	24.20	37.22
N (unweighted)	220	55	15	532	113	39
1985						
Tickets sold out	0.87	3.90	NA	1.40	1.23	0.00
Cost	21.68	51.31	NA	28.63	39.26	54.62
Not available	24.25	30.81	NA	23.43	12.73	15.56
Child care	8.69	8.76	NA	10.97	2.57	21.15
Too far to go	15.13	9.30	NA	14.22	5.75	0.00
Transportation	5.74	22.93	NA	5.20	7.56	2.68
Fear crime	2.71	11.42	NA	1.12	3.52	4.04
Lacks motivation	11.05	0.00	NA	14.88	3.62	31.32
Too little time	47.23	19.83	NA	45.16	41.48	30.54
N (unweighted)	102	20	4	241	59	21

In 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported discomfort, no one to go with, handicap, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4-2: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Classical Music Performances More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Cost	32.83	34.71	55.96	28.30	43.96	48.43
Not available	21.44	0.00	8.92	23.27	14.32	8.07
No one to go with	7.63	9.61	19.11	7.18	6.40	2.31
Child care	5.28	21.98	0.00	7.51	9.96	8.66
Handicap	2.32	0.00	8.78	10.04	7.81	2.88
Too far to go	17.24	0.00	15.76	15.02	12.31	19.69
Transportation	7.19	8.00	19.11	8.15	20.50	15.43
Lacks motivation	11.79	17.61	9.00	14.71	6.73	3.18
Too little time	41.40	35.30	16.13	39.10	34.53	32.96
N (unweighted)	303	14	10	552	48	36
1985						
Cost	22.93	NA	NA	30.08	23.53	NA
Not available	18.34	NA	NA	23.79	3.76	NA
No one to go with	9.14	NA	NA	5.83	8.32	NA
Child care	7.65	NA	NA	10.17	10.74	NA
Handicap	3.27	NA	NA	6.43	3.03	NA
Too far to go	11.50	NA	NA	25.46	10.28	NA
Transportation	5.76	NA	NA	8.55	16.86	NA
Lacks motivation	16.42	NA	NA	12.06	9.50	NA
Too little time	51.06	NA	NA	34.70	47.98	NA
N (unweighted)	130	7	4	207	23	9

In 1985, too few Black and Hispanic attenders and Hispanic non-attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, crime, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4-3: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Opera Performances More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Cost	38.47	NA	NA	34.55	38.52	68.01
Not available	32.95	NA	NA	25.98	8.63	6.82
No one to go with	11.68	NA	NA	9.22	3.30	11.98
Handicap	4.32	NA	NA	10.56	2.09	7.24
Too far to go	14.15	NA	NA	17.40	12.27	36.14
Transportation	9.84	NA	NA	8.39	11.52	7.24
Lacks motivation	7.02	NA	NA	10.34	10.28	0.00
Too little time	20.21	NA	NA	30.27	30.48	15.05
N (unweighted)	50	1	1	311	23	14
1985						
Cost	43.54	NA	NA	36.59	8.99	NA
Not available	17.55	NA	NA	14.31	10.87	NA
No one to go with	3.56	NA	NA	6.38	5.68	NA
Handicap	0.00	NA	NA	5.42	0.00	NA
Too far to go	16.14	NA	NA	25.97	13.59	NA
Transportation	4.51	NA	NA	13.00	30.16	NA
Lacks motivation	4.61	NA	NA	16.49	0.00	NA
Too little time	56.36	NA	NA	33.48	61.20	NA
N (unweighted)	21	2	0	141	10	7

In 1982 and 1985, too few Black and Hispanic attenders, and in 1985 too few Hispanic non-attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, child care, crime, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4-4: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Musical Theatre Performances More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Cost	36.56	55.08	62.86	30.93	47.08	37.41
Not available	22.75	13.90	19.15	21.02	11.85	13.12
No one to go with	6.92	9.33	7.14	8.79	3.09	8.81
Child care	6.09	10.98	3.18	7.58	11.68	16.15
Too far to go	15.65	5.26	15.98	15.95	4.95	29.42
Transportation	7.42	4.46	8.92	7.56	8.18	17.40
Fear crime	2.75	7.49	3.95	3.57	3.41	5.17
Lacks motivation	10.79	24.01	3.99	12.07	12.18	9.44
Too little time	36.58	44.78	33.08	36.52	29.30	32.90
N (unweighted)	620	24	23	969	81	44
1985						
Cost	28.83	53.27	NA	32.10	43.48	53.39
Not available	17.86	13.47	NA	19.07	15.20	0.00
No one to go with	5.81	4.81	NA	5.55	12.04	14.46
Child care	4.99	0.00	NA	10.33	7.07	17.07
Too far to go	16.31	0.00	NA	18.84	15.40	5.99
Transportation	7.26	4.29	NA	8.83	14.24	0.00
Fear crime	2.35	0.00	NA	2.95	12.24	0.00
Lacks motivation	13.19	10.17	NA	15.14	2.95	14.38
Too little time	47.05	33.31	NA	34.07	25.51	37.28
N (unweighted)	247	17	5	373	40	15

In 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, handicap, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4-5: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Plays More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
1982	W	B	H	W	B	H
Cost	30.83	69.64	NA	31.10	24.18	43.63
Not available	22.32	7.81	NA	19.59	20.23	10.72
Child care	5.90	0.00	NA	8.49	13.64	9.50
Handicap	2.79	11.45	NA	5.34	3.91	0.00
Too far to go	14.91	8.69	NA	15.35	9.93	6.07
Transportation	5.79	12.08	NA	5.98	8.51	5.93
Fear crime	1.52	11.45	NA	3.20	0.00	3.45
Poor quality	5.18	0.00	NA	3.27	10.29	0.00
Lacks motivation	11.33	13.20	NA	13.85	10.12	11.53
Too little time	41.17	42.89	NA	38.68	14.80	40.82
N (unweighted)	364	15	NA	852	48	27
1985						
Cost	28.32	43.07	NA	25.14	37.64	60.19
Not available	22.01	18.70	NA	21.39	9.54	0.00
Child care	8.87	8.06	NA	7.40	7.96	5.76
Handicap	2.58	0.00	NA	3.82	4.73	0.00
Too far to go	14.44	10.63	NA	17.25	4.14	0.00
Transportation	5.78	10.63	NA	5.08	13.51	5.82
Fear crime	3.30	8.06	NA	1.61	4.14	0.00
Poor quality	6.37	4.66	NA	1.15	0.00	0.00
Lacks motivation	12.23	0.00	NA	12.81	2.41	25.30
Too little time	43.38	21.54	NA	39.10	38.72	50.91
N (unweighted)	149	12	1	358	24	13

In 1982 and 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, no one to go with, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4-6: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Ballet Performances More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Cost	43.21	NA	NA	28.98	42.93	45.93
Not available	27.91	NA	NA	27.08	13.90	16.33
No one to go with	8.15	NA	NA	11.96	6.97	12.85
Child care	6.07	NA	NA	7.22	11.62	16.72
Handicap	3.00	NA	NA	8.27	3.09	10.01
Too far to go	10.91	NA	NA	15.88	13.61	20.38
Transportation	8.37	NA	NA	7.74	10.69	17.29
Fear crime	1.76	NA	NA	2.84	0.00	14.32
Lacks motivation	3.12	NA	NA	13.35	2.61	21.39
Too little time	27.35	NA	NA	32.23	32.72	26.47
N (unweighted)	100	2	4	468	31	22
1985						
Cost	23.60	NA	NA	33.31	36.98	43.72
Not available	26.81	NA	NA	17.72	0.00	7.50
No one to go with	8.71	NA	NA	10.90	9.07	14.03
Child care	8.26	NA	NA	11.23	6.19	12.60
Handicap	1.87	NA	NA	5.89	0.00	0.00
Too far to go	10.61	NA	NA	22.11	5.65	15.63
Transportation	1.94	NA	NA	6.93	0.00	5.43
Fear crime	0.00	NA	NA	3.18	11.84	0.00
Lacks motivation	8.26	NA	NA	14.20	0.00	9.05
Too little time	42.47	NA	NA	35.29	51.09	28.31
N (unweighted)	45	5	2	204	16	16

In 1982 and 1985, too few Black and Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4-7: Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Art Museums and Galleries More Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), Blacks (B), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 ms.			Did not attend during past 12 months		
	W	B	H	W	B	H
1982						
Cost	6.95	7.40	28.98	10.73	22.66	0.00
Not available	25.09	5.79	19.00	24.81	15.31	7.11
No one to go with	5.23	2.99	10.22	5.97	6.62	9.67
Child care	3.49	15.86	4.69	5.44	6.46	15.43
Too far to go	16.96	5.05	28.05	20.25	10.46	5.85
Transportation	5.23	22.31	6.97	6.46	11.68	13.21
Lacks motivation	14.58	13.34	2.81	12.84	17.76	13.19
Too little time	51.01	51.80	67.86	40.12	30.85	47.33
N (unweighted)	606	26	40	812	89	48
1985						
Cost	9.40	11.07	11.00	13.78	17.37	29.65
Not available	20.04	0.00	16.61	23.98	15.09	0.00
No one to go with	2.39	20.42	9.98	6.74	5.37	0.00
Child care	5.79	0.00	5.92	5.39	3.60	8.54
Too far to go	25.20	15.51	7.81	21.28	6.80	8.96
Transportation	6.30	14.82	3.33	10.70	18.94	14.82
Lacks motivation	14.32	0.00	21.71	16.75	7.94	34.49
Too little time	48.29	33.72	45.77	38.90	52.72	74.05
N (unweighted)	274	52	21	323	20	18

Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, handicap, crime, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 5-1: Results of Factor Analysis of Core and Other Activity Participation Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

VARIABLES	FACTORS 1	2	3	4
ATTEND JAZZ	.018	.407	.343	.060
ATTEND CLASSICAL	.307	.551	.029	.108
ATTEND OPERA	-.031	.479	.001	.039
ATTEND MUSICAL	.360	.573	-.019	.047
ATTEND PLAY	.272	.607	.040	.064
ATTEND BALLET	.003	.602	.151	.054
VISIT ART EXHIBIT	.599	.341	.172	-.018
PERFORM ON INSTRUMENT	.049	-.002	-.045	.716
PERFORM: ACT, SING, DANCE	.057	.002	.002	.777
READ NOVELS, ETC.	.481	.148	.210	.044
VISIT SCIENCE OR HISTORY MUSEUM	.651	.164	.023	.011
VISIT HISTORIC MONUMENT	.686	.153	.144	.000
READ/LISTEN TO POETRY	.284	.234	.415	.092
VISIT ART/CRAFT FAIR	.670	.084	.173	.034
ART LESSONS	.098	.038	.603	.150
MAKE POTTERY	.297	-.216	.435	.065
DO NEEDLECRAFTS	.397	-.150	.136	.102
WORK ON PLAY SET	.104	.105	.187	.565
WORK ON MUSIC SET	-.044	.155	.087	.557
CREATIVE WRITING	-.014	.220	.618	.167
DO PHOTOGRAPHY	.192	.070	.452	-.044
PAINT OR DRAW	.172	-.025	.622	-.077

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales.

Appendix Table 5-2: Results of Factor Analysis of Socialization Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

VARIABLES	FACTORS 1	2
PARENTS LISTENED TO CLASSICAL MUSIC	.097	.748
PARENTS TOOK CHILD TO ART MUSEUMS	.174	.747
PARENTS TOOK CHILD TO PLAYS/CONCERTS	.128	.777
PARENTS ENCOURAGED CHILD TO READ	.208	.604
INSTRUMENTAL/SINGING CLASS/LESSONS	.494	.320
ART CLASS/LESSONS	.693	.082
ACTING CLASS/LESSONS	.542	.072
BALLET CLASS/LESSONS	.322	.268
WRITING CLASS/LESSONS	.667	.113
CRAFT CLASS/LESSONS	.559	.083
ART APPRECIATION CLASS/LESSONS	.680	.220
MUSIC APPRECIATION CLASS/LESSONS	.618	.256

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales. Only lessons taken before age of 18 are included.

Appendix Table 5-3: Results of Factor Analysis of Music Preference Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

VARIABLES	FACTORS 1	2	3
CLASSICAL/CHAMBER	.713	.030	-.004
OPERA	.665	-.075	-.092
OPERETTA/SHOW TUNES	.695	.115	.165
JAZZ	.353	-.006	.648
SOUL/BLUES	.204	.099	.659
BIG BAND	.549	.299	.153
COUNTRY WESTERN	-.214	.701	.024
BLUEGRASS	.063	.730	.207
ROCK	-.202	.058	.712
MOOD/EASY LISTENING	.437	.226	.202
FOLK	.362	.623	.144
BARBERSHOP	.420	.526	-.107
HYMNS/GOSPEL	.214	.430	-.315

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales.

Table 5-4: Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables for the Full Sample, and by Race and Spanish Origin, by Education, by Gender and by Age -- Including Respondents without Data on Parental Education

	N	Lessons	Home	Art Music	Attend	Visit	Attend No Jazz	Perform	Davis	Tvart
FULL SAMPLE	2255	1.166	1.085	1.396	0.533	2.127	0.436	0.116	0.723	1.347
		1.408	0.957	1.407	0.980	1.745	0.854	0.438	1.105	1.795
RACE/SP ORIGIN										
White	1908	1.240	1.134	1.509	0.571	2.288	0.483	0.116	0.762	1.404
		1.426	0.973	1.416	1.015	1.734	0.895	0.443	1.124	1.822
Black	230	0.864	0.860	0.720	0.365	1.203	0.197	0.094	0.449	1.082
		1.318	0.839	1.193	0.768	1.531	0.564	0.360	0.860	1.609
Hispanic	117	0.667	0.800	1.084	0.305	1.597	0.214	0.166	0.708	1.027
		1.072	0.799	1.230	0.738	1.609	0.547	0.515	1.191	1.666
EDUCATION										
11 & Less	607	0.467	0.550	0.785	0.143	0.945	0.112	0.075	0.273	0.675
		0.989	0.697	1.179	0.446	1.176	0.403	0.337	0.685	1.379
12 Years	919	1.192	1.014	1.312	0.376	2.174	0.296	0.099	0.675	1.241
		1.338	0.858	1.276	0.763	1.648	0.667	0.380	1.027	1.662
13-15 Yrs	390	1.646	1.517	1.744	0.811	2.689	0.665	0.158	1.034	1.644
		1.547	0.945	1.486	1.153	1.676	0.999	0.516	1.288	1.820
16 & Over	339	1.766	1.708	2.275	1.305	3.416	1.101	0.183	1.279	2.450
		1.510	1.020	1.445	1.356	1.614	1.190	0.599	1.294	2.118
GENDER										
Male	1008	1.118	0.993	1.259	0.449	1.714	0.352	0.096	0.665	1.277
		1.348	0.884	1.341	0.882	1.576	0.752	0.398	1.065	1.747
Female	1247	1.209	1.167	1.517	0.608	2.494	0.511	0.134	0.775	1.409
		1.458	1.010	1.453	1.054	1.805	0.929	0.471	1.137	1.835
AGE										
18-30	729	1.800	1.229	0.989	0.515	2.350	0.361	0.143	1.071	1.160
		1.632	0.897	1.121	0.950	1.725	0.771	0.479	1.325	1.559
31-51	768	1.098	1.089	1.618	0.632	2.325	0.535	0.135	0.739	1.457
		1.289	0.955	1.471	1.046	1.742	0.920	0.487	1.063	1.837
Over 51	756	0.603	0.937	1.569	0.448	1.696	0.407	0.068	0.358	1.419
		0.953	0.994	1.505	0.928	1.688	0.852	0.322	0.723	1.951

Appendix Table 5-5: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing-Arts Events Attended, 1982 Full Sample

I.V.	Jazz Included		Jazz Not Included	
BLACK	-.074 d	-.008	-.103 d	-.033 d
HISPANIC	-.056 d	.013	-.061 d	.012
FEMALE		.088 d		.100 d
AGE		.095 d		.132 d
EDUCATION		.299 d		.298 d
OCCUPATION		.109 d		.105 d
INCOME X 10,000		.132 d		.141 d
SINGLE/DIVORCED		.110 d		.089 d
SMSA RESIDENCE		.063 d		.057 d
d.f.	15012	15012	15012	15012
R squared	.008	.193	.013	.191

Standardized regression coefficients.
a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01
c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001

Appendix Table 5-8: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing Events Attended (Including Jazz)

I.V.	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.067 b	.015	.026	.031
HISPANIC	-.061 b	-.002	.012	.001
FEMALE		.107 d	.080 d	.076 d
AGE		.119 d	.150 d	.065 b
EDUCATION		.280 d	.196 d	.123 d
OCCUPATION		.125 d	.112 d	.090 d
INCOME X 10,000		.144 d	.128 d	.098 d
SINGLE/DIVORCED		.088 d	.065 b	.052 b
METROPOLITAN		.051 a	.034	.017
HOME SOCIALIZATION			.165 d	.076 c
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.129 d	.074 c
HOURS WATCH TV				-.077 d
LIKES ART MUSIC				.085 c
WATCH TV ARTS				.257 d
d.f.	2254	2254	2254	2254
R Squared	.007	.182	.226	.299

*Standardized beta coefficients.
a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01
c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001
Models based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-9: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing Events Attended (Excluding Jazz)

I.V.	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.107 d	-.022	-.013	-.006
HISPANIC	-.070 c	-.008	.004	-.007
FEMALE		.117 d	.094 d	.089 d
AGE		.152 d	.178 d	.093 d
EDUCATION		.275 d	.202 d	.129 d
OCCUPATION		.123 d	.112 d	.089 d
INCOME X 10,000		.150 d	.136 d	.106 d
SINGLE/DIVORCED		.068 b	.048 a	.036
METROPOLITAN		.043 a	.029	.012
HOME SOCIALIZATION			.144 d	.058 b
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.106 d	.052 a
HOURS WATCH TV				-.079 d
LIKES ART MUSIC				.101 d
WATCH TV ARTS				.234 d
d.f.	2254	2254	2254	2254
R Squared	.014	.183	.215	.283

*Standardized beta coefficients.
a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01
c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-12: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Creative Activities

I.V.	1	2	3	4
BLACK	-.091 d	-.056 b	-.035	-.032
HISPANIC	-.011	.016	.043 a	.034
FEMALE		.074 c	.038 a	.039 a
AGE		-.151 d	-.074 c	-.133 d
EDUCATION		.215 d	.104 d	.050 a
OCCUPATION		.098 d	.082 d	.062 b
INCOME X 10,000		-.024	-.047 a	-.070 c
SINGLE/DIVORCED		.096 d	.059 b	.049 a
METROPOLITAN		-.018	-.044 a	-.056 b
HOME SOCIALIZATION			.148 d	.081 c
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.300 d	.261 d
HOURS WATCH TV				-.088 d
LIKES ART MUSIC				.039
WATCH TV ARTS				.205 d
d.f.	2254	2254	2254	2254
R Squared	.007	.149	.258	.301

*Standardized beta coefficients.
a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01
c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-13: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Lessons Taken Before Age 18 and Number of Kinds of Activities with Parents as Child, by Race

	Kinds of Lessons			Activities with Parents		
I.V.s	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	-.016	-.025	-.015	.009	-.003	.007
	.002	.066	.008	.001	.004	.005
	-.194	-.333	-.206	.159	-.064	.132
	d	d		d		
FEMALE	.185	-.106	.168	.223	.295	.048
	.067	.204	.253	.043	.124	.164
	.064	-.039	.073	.114	.166	.030
	b			d	a	
FATHER'S EDUCATION	.070	.061	.109	.100	.098	.068
	.014	.047	.052	.009	.029	.033
	.161	.130	.313	.340	.317	.283
	d		a	d	d	a
MOTHER'S EDUCATION	.085	.061	-.055	.090	.085	.053
	.016	.051	.064	.011	.031	.041
	.171	.128	-.127	.269	.273	.181
	d			d	b	
df	1525	140	83	1525	140	83
Adj. R squared	.187	.217	.047	.267	.329	.154

a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01
c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample, respondents with information on parents' education only..

Appendix Table 5-14: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	.023	.004	.003	.026	.011	.003
	.002	.005	.008	.002	.005	.008
	.296	.069	.046	.337	.174	.036
	d			d	a	
FEMALE	.353	.110	.201	.243	.089	.198
	.058	.153	.229	.057	.140	.220
	.124	.046	.082	.086	.037	.080
	d			d		
EDUCATION	.175	.070	.077	.122	.041	.038
	.012	.028	.038	.013	.025	.038
	.346	.225	.243	.241	.131	.122
	d	a	a	d		
OCCUPATION	.190	.574	-.186	.175	.265	-.193
	.068	.196	.278	.066	.183	.266
	.065	.205	-.067	.060	.095	-.069
	b	b		b		
INCOME	.098	.008	-.052	.080	.023	-.059
X 10,000	.021	.075	.103	.021	.069	.100
	.105	.008	-.051	.086	.022	-.058
	d			d		
SINGLE/DIVORCED	.128	-.106	.405	.023	-.074	.280
	.073	.178	.268	.071	.161	.261
	.039	-.041	.155	.007	-.029	.107
LIVES IN SMSA	.201	.358	.305	.153	.222	.239
	.062	.189	.411	.060	.172	.395
	.068	.124	.069	.052	.077	.054
	b			a		
HOME ACTIVITIES				.261	.491	.350
				.033	.095	.148
				.180	.345	.227
				d	d	a

Appendix Table 5-14 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.158	.176	.205
				.023	.061	.114
				.159	.195	.179
				d	b	
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
Adj. R Squared	.214	.133	.028	.272	.290	.108

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December subsample.

Appendix Table 5-15: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Television Arts Program Watched in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	.020	.003	.005	.024	.015	.001
	.002	.007	.012	.002	.007	.011
	.204	.037	.046	.245	.174	.015
	d			d	a	
FEMALE	.255	.099	-.096	.073	.034	-.074
	.078	.208	.316	.075	.188	.285
	.070	.031	-.029	.020	.010	-.022
	c					
EDUCATION	.206	.064	.096	.124	.026	.017
	.016	.037	.052	.017	.034	.049
	.317	.151	.225	.191	.061	.041
	d			d		
OCCUPATION	.120	.594	-.291	.114	.169	-.303
	.091	.266	.383	.087	.243	.347
	.032	.157	-.077	.030	.045	-.080
		a				
INCOME	.116	.166	.037	.090	.188	.048
X 10,000	.029	.102	.142	.027	.091	.129
	.097	.117	.027	.075	.132	.034
	d			c	a	
SINGLE/DIVORCED	.335	.323	.370	.177	.363	.177
	.098	.242	.369	.093	.213	.338
	.080	.094	.104	.042	.105	.050
	c					
LIVES IN SMSA	.256	.477	-.230	.183	.244	-.303
	.083	.256	.566	.079	.228	.516
	.067	.123	-.038	.048	.063	-.050
	b			a		
HOME ACTIVITIES				.451	.693	.875
				.044	.126	.192
				.241	.361	.419
				d	d	d

Appendix Table 5-15 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.215	.294	.223
				.030	.082	.147
				.168	.240	.143
				d	c	
HOURS TV				.030	.037	-.001
				.018	.028	.069
				.035	.077	-.001
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
Adj. R Squared	.151	.121	-.004	.236	.319	.186

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-16: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, including Jazz, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	.006	.002	.001	.008	.004	.000	.003	.002	.000
	.001	.003	.005	.001	.003	.005	.001	.003	.005
	.118	.042	.027	.151	.097	.011	.063	.045	.001
	d			d			b		
FEMALE	.257	.018	.127	.192	.007	.132	.175	.004	.145
	.042	.093	.137	.042	.091	.134	.040	.090	.131
	.126	.012	.086	.095	.005	.090	.086	.002	.098
	d			d			d		
EDUCATION	.112	.045	.003	.081	.034	-.016	.052	.029	-.019
	.009	.017	.022	.009	.016	.023	.009	.016	.023
	.309	.222	.014	.223	.168	-.082	.144	.145	-.099
	d	b		d	a		d		
OCCUPATION	.198	.529	.269	.189	.417	.266	.141	.386	.296
	.050	.119	.166	.048	.119	.162	.046	.117	.159
	.094	.294	.161	.090	.232	.159	.067	.214	.177
	d	d		d	c		b	b	
INCOME	.086	.113	.121	.076	.117	.124	.055	.096	.113
X 10,000	.016	.046	.061	.015	.044	.061	.015	.044	.059
	.128	.168	.196	.113	.174	.201	.082	.143	.183
	d	a		d	b	a	c	a	
SINGLE/	.242	-.013	.151	.181	-.093	.107	.150	-.038	.087
DIVORCED	.053	.108	.160	.052	.112	.159	.050	.103	.155
	.104	-.008	.096	.078	-.050	.068	.064	-.023	.055
	d			c			b		
LIVES IN	.116	-.046	-.203	.088	-.093	-.220	.051	-.126	-.154
SMSA	.045	.114	.245	.041	.112	.241	.042	.110	.237
	.055	-.025	-.077	.042	-.050	-.083	.024	-.068	-.058
	a			a					
HOME ACTIVITIES				.153	.191	.204	.069	.096	.088
				.025	.062	.090	.024	.066	.096
				.147	.209	.220	.066	.105	.096
				d	b	a	b		

Appendix Table 5-16 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.092	.053	.050	.053	.016	.023
				.017	.040	.069	.016	.040	.068
				.129	.092	.073	.075	.027	.033
					d			d	
HOURS TV							-.037	-.007	-.018
							.010	.013	.032
							-.078	-.030	-.050
								c	
ART MUSIC							.063	.037	-.020
							.018	.046	.066
							.088	.058	-.033
								c	
TV ART PROGRAMS							.143	.109	.142
							.014	.035	.051
							.257	.229	.320
							d	b	b
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
R Squared	.188	.234	.039	.226	.280	.081	.301	.315	.134

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-17: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, Excluding Jazz, by Race

I.V.s	Model 1 W	Model 1 B	Model 1 H	Model 2 W	Model 2 B	Model 2 H	Model 3 W	Model 3 B	Model 3 H
AGE	.007	.007	.002	.008	.008	.001	.004	.006	.001
	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.004
	.140	.237	.061	.168	.258	.041	.079	.205	.034
	d	b		d	b		b		
FEMALE	.239	.070	.095	.190	.057	.100	.172	.057	.108
	.037	.067	.100	.037	.067	.098	.036	.066	.098
	.134	.062	.087	.106	.050	.091	.096	.050	.098
	d			d			d		
EDUCATION	.097	.038	.010	.073	.032	-.004	.048	.028	-.005
	.008	.012	.016	.008	.012	.017	.008	.012	.017
	.304	.254	.073	.230	.215	-.027	.149	.188	-.039
	d	b		d	b		d	a	
OCCUPATION	.174	.411	.196	.168	.358	.194	.125	.331	.210
	.044	.086	.122	.043	.087	.119	.042	.086	.118
	.094	.311	.158	.090	.270	.156	.067	.250	.169
	d	d		d	d		b	c	
INCOME	.077	.113	.099	.069	.112	.102	.051	.098	.095
X 10,000	.014	.033	.045	.014	.033	.044	.013	.032	.044
	.131	.227	.216	.117	.225	.222	.086	.198	.209
	d	c	a	d	c	a	d	b	a
SINGLE/	.158	.041	.098	.111	.046	.066	.085	.025	.055
DIVORCED	.047	.078	.117	.047	.077	.116	.044	.076	.116
	.077	.034	.084	.054	.038	.057	.041	.021	.047
	c			a					
LIVES IN	.095	-.155	-.003	.074	-.171	-.014	.040	-.194	.023
SMSA	.040	.083	.180	.039	.082	.176	.038	.081	.177
	.051	-.113	-.002	.039	-.125	-.007	.022	-.142	.012
	a				a			a	
HOME ACTIVITIES				.118	.122	.163	.044	.054	.099
				.022	.045	.066	.022	.048	.071
				.128	.181	.239	.048	.080	.145
				d	b	a	a		

Appendix Table 5-17 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.070	.001	.031	.037	-.025	.016
				.015	.029	.051	.015	.030	.051
				.112	.002	.062	.058	-.058	.032
				d			a		
HOURS TV							-.032	-.007	-.010
							.009	.010	.024
							-.076	-.043	-.037
							d		
ART MUSIC							.067	.038	-.012
							.016	.034	.049
							.105	.081	-.027
							d		
TV ART PROGRAMS							.118	.070	.079
							.012	.026	.038
							.239	.198	.241
							d	b	a
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
R Squared	.182	.258	.058	.210	.278	.106	.283	.309	.125

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-18: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

I.V.s	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	-.007	-.009	-.002	-.002	-.008	-.001	-.011	-.005	-.001
	.002	.006	.010	.002	.006	.009	.002	.006	.008
	-.071 b	-.109	-.017	-.025	-.009	-.015	-.118 d	-.062	-.012
FEMALE	1.015	.537	.182	.874	.503	.152	.838	.518	.197
	.067	.178	.276	.065	.158	.250	.061	.157	.215
	.292 d	.174 b	.057	.252 d	.163 b	.047	.241 d	.168 b	.061
EDUCATION	.256	.089	.141	.188	.051	.081	.136	.039	.078
	.014	.032	.045	.015	.029	.043	.014	.028	.037
	.413 d	.222 b	.343 b	.303 d	.127	.197	.220 d	.097	.190 a
OCCUPATION	.129	1.009	.732	.111	.613	.721	.024	.531	.890
	.079	.228	.334	.075	.207	.302	.071	.204	.260
	.036	.281 d	.201 a	.031	.171 b	.198 a	.007	.148 b	.244 c
INCOME	.085	.130	.048	.062	.146	.016	.026	.116	.002
X 10,000	.025	.088	.124	.024	.078	.113	.022	.076	.097
	.074 c	.097	.035	.054 b	.109	.012	.022	.086	.002
SINGLE/	.036	-.427	-.107	-.100	-.386	-.359	-.151	-.430	-.436
DIVORCED	.084	.207	.323	.081	.183	.296	.076	.180	.254
	.009	-.130 a	-.031	-.025	-.118 a	-.105	-.038 a	-.131 a	-.127
LIVES IN	.092	-.012	-.361	.030	-.181	-.515	-.037	-.233	-.423
SMSA	.072	.219	.494	.069	.195	.448	.064	.191	.388
	.025	-.003	-.062	.008	-.049	-.089	-.010	-.063	-.073
HOME ACTIVITIES				.326	.658	.421	.178	.485	.009
				.038	.108	.168	.037	.114	.157
				.183 d	.360 d	.209 a	.100 d	.266 d	.004

Appendix Table 5-18 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.214	.203	.485	.146	.143	.384
				.026	.070	.129	.025	.071	.120
				.176	.174	.323	.120	.123	.256
				d	b	c	d	a	c
HOURS TV							-.065	-.029	.057
							.015	.023	.052
							-.079	-.064	.074
							d		
ART MUSIC							.136	.113	-.025
							.028	.080	.107
							.111	.088	-.019
							d		
TV ART PROGRAMS							.234	.163	.476
							.021	.061	.083
							.246	.171	.494
							d	b	d
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
R Squared	.302	.290	.176	.367	.448	.330	.445	.476	.511

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-19: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

I.V.s	Model 1 W	Model 1 B	Model 1 H	Model 2 W	Model 2 B	Model 2 H	Model 3 W	Model 3 B	Model 3 H
AGE	-.001	-.000	-.004	-.000	-.000	-.004	-.001	-.000	-.004
	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.003	.001	.002	.003
	-.045	-.018	-.123	-.014	-.008	-.155	-.058 a	-.016	-.140
FEMALE	.050	-.001	.090	.034	-.002	.091	.028	-.011	.101
	.020	.050	.096	.020	.050	.094	.020	.051	.095
	.057 a	-.001	.087	.039	-.003	.088	.032	-.006	.098
EDUCATION	.017	.003	-.016	.010	.002	-.029	.004	.002	-.030
	.004	.009	.016	.005	.009	.016	.005	.009	.016
	.109 d	.031	-.123	.061 a	.020	-.223	.024	.024	-.224
OCCUPATION	.025	.099	.042	.024	.088	.039	.015	.092	.039
	.024	.064	.116	.024	.066	.114	.024	.067	.115
	.027	.117	.036	.026	.105	.034	.016	.109	.033
INCOME	-.017	-.017	.091	-.020	-.017	.091	-.024	-.018	.085
X 10,000	.008	.024	.043	.007	.025	.042	.007	.025	.043
	-.059 a	-.053	.212 a	-.068 b	-.052	.212 a	-.082 b	-.055	.197
SINGLE/	.020	.084	.186	.002	.085	.148	-.003	.084	.151
DIVORCED	.026	.058	.112	.025	.058	.111	.025	.059	.113
	.019	.109	.169	.002	.110	.135	-.002	.109	.137
LIVES IN	-.035	.002	.188	-.043	-.002	.170	-.050	-.008	.204
SMSA	.022	.061	.172	.022	.062	.168	.022	.063	.172
	-.038	.002	.102	-.046 a	-.002	.092	-.054 a	-.009	.110
HOME ACTIVITIES				.026	.019	.133	.010	.015	.111
				.012	.034	.063	.012	.037	.070
				.057 a	.044	.207 a	.022	.035	.172

Appendix Table 5-19 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.037	.004	.055	.029	-.000	.054
				.008	.022	.048	.008	.023	.050
				.118	.014	.115	.093	-.001	.111
				d			c		
HOURS TV							-.004	.006	-.012
							.005	.008	.023
							-.021	.057	-.047
ART MUSIC							.022	.011	-.038
							.009	.026	.048
							.070	.036	-.090
							a		
TV ART PROGRAMS							.022	-.000	.042
							.007	.020	.037
							.089	-.001	.135
							b		
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
R Squared	.018	.002	.028	.034	-.004	.075	.047	-.014	.063

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-20: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of NonPerformance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	B	H	W	B	H	W	B	H
AGE	-.010	-.003	-.011	-.005	.004	-.012	-.009	.003	-.013
	.001	.004	.008	.001	.004	.007	.001	.004	.007
	-.168 d	-.054	-.157	-.091 d	.092	-.176	-.150 d	.060	-.185
FEMALE	.223	-.041	-.042	.124	.001	-.038	.116	.010	.010
	.048	.107	.219	.045	.098	.203	.044	.099	.184
	.099 d	-.024	-.018	.055 b	.000	-.016	.052 b	.006	.004
EDUCATION	.099	.039	.040	.052	.026	-.008	.028	.022	-.011
	.010	.019	.036	.010	.018	.035	.010	.018	.032
	.247 d	.172 a	.132	.129 d	.117	-.025	.069 b	.099	-.037
OCCUPATION	.129	.702	.311	.121	.527	.303	.073	.499	.376
	.056	.137	.266	.053	.128	.245	.052	.129	.223
	.056 a	.348 d	.115	.052 a	.261 d	.112	.031	.247 d	.139
INCOME	-.023	-.043	.020	-.039	-.015	.019	-.057	-.025	-.011
X 10,000	.018	.053	.098	.017	.048	.092	.016	.048	.083
	-.031	-.056	.020	-.053 a	-.019	.019	-.076 c	-.033	-.011
SINGLE/	.313	-.022	.075	.206	.002	-.064	.179	-.016	-.094
DIVORCED	.060	.124	.256	.057	.113	.240	.055	.114	.217
	.121 d	-.012	.030	.080 c	.001	-.025	.069 b	-.008	-.037
LIVES IN	-.064	.072	-.171	-.111	-.044	-.236	-.142	-.059	-.070
SMSA	.051	.132	.392	.048	.121	.363	.047	.121	.332
	-.028	.035	-.040	-.047 a	-.021	-.055	-.060 b	-.028	-.016
HOME ACTIVITIES				.158	.067	.481	.088	.009	.210
				.027	.066	.136	.027	.072	.134
				.137 d	.065	.323 c	.077 c	.009	.141

Appendix Table 5-20 (con.)

CHILDHOOD LESSONS				.229	.268	.202	.200	.249	.146
				.018	.043	.104	.018	.044	.096
				.291	.410	.182	.254	.381	.131
				d	d		d	d	
HOURS TV							-.046	-.013	-.026
							.011	.015	.044
							-.088	-.050	-.046
							d		
ART MUSIC							.041	.026	-.121
							.020	.051	.092
							.051	.035	-.125
							a		
TV ART PROGRAMS							.120	.061	.362
							.015	.039	.071
							.194	.115	.503
							d		d
df	1907	229	116	1907	229	116	1907	229	116
R Squared	.158	.188	.053	.257	.331	.194	.299	.336	.347

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-21: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Lessons Taken Before Age 18, Number of Kinds of Activities with Parents as Child, and Number of-Kinds of Television Arts Programs Watched, by Gender

I.V.s	Lessons M	Lessons F	Parents M	Parents F	Arts on TV M	Arts on TV F	Arts on TV M	Arts on TV F
BLACK	-.251	-.595	-.248	-.334	.163	.036	.167	.159
	.126	.118	.088	.087	.172	.154	.164	.145
	-.058	-.133	-.088	-.108	.029	.006	.030	.028
	a	d	b	d				
HISPANIC	-.689	-.707	-.260	-.472	.243	-.100	.357	.134
	.171	.177	.120	.131	.232	.228	.222	.214
	-.117	-.105	-.068	-.101	.032	-.012	.047	.016
	d	d	a	c				
AGE	-.029	-.028	-.009	-.008	.021	.017	.026	.021
	.002	.002	.002	.002	.003	.003	.003	.003
	-.381	-.365	-.178	-.141	.218	.176	.265	.213
	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d
EDUCATION					.149	.215	.098	.120
					.020	.021	.019	.021
					.291	.324	.191	.180
					d	d	d	d
OCCUPATION					.460	-.069	.322	-.035
					.123	.114	.119	.108
					.127	-.018	.089	-.009
					c		b	
INCOME X 10,000					.063	.161	.040	.133
					.040	.037	.038	.035
					.054	.131	.034	.108
						d		d
SINGLE/ DIVORCED					.462	.220	.349	.063
					.130	.121	.124	.113
					.119	.052	.090	.015
					c		b	
LIVES IN SMSA					.225	.313	.120	.236
					.114	.107	.109	.100
					.060	.080	.032	.060
					a	b		a
CHILDHOOD LESSONS							.239	.205
							.042	.036
							.184	.163
							d	d

Appendix Table 5-21 (con.)

HOME							.426	.536
ACTIVITIES							.064	.053
							.216	.295
							d	d
HOURS TV/							.041	.031
DAY							.025	.018
							.047	.043
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.153	.148	.039	.034	.141	.150	.219	.265

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-22: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F
BLACK	-.305	-.507	-.297	-.398
	.125	.118	.122	.112
	-.071	-.113	-.069	-.089
	a	d	a	c
HISPANIC	.111	-.094	.184	.059
	.169	.175	.164	.166
	.019	-.014	.032	.009
AGE	.020	.021	.024	.024
	.002	.002	.002	.002
	.273	.269	.315	.307
	d	d	d	d
EDUCATION	.135	.178	.105	.111
	.014	.016	.014	.016
	.343	.338	.268	.211
	d	d	d	d
OCCUPATION	.324	.119	.235	.124
	.089	.088	.088	.083
	.116	.039	.085	.040
	c		b	
INCOME X 10,000	.077	.096	.063	.075
	.029	.028	.028	.027
	.085	.099	.069	.076
	b	c	a	b
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	.039	.176	-.024	.063
	.094	.093	.092	.088
	.013	.052	-.008	.019
LIVES IN SMSA	.230	.214	.171	.160
	.083	.082	.081	.078
	.080	.069	.060	.052
	b	b	a	a
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.155	.164
			.031	.028
			.155	.164
			d	d

Appendix Table 5-22 (con.)

HOME			.217	.341
ACTIVITIES			.047	.041
			.143	.237
			d	d
df	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.223	.201	.270	.287

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-23: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Including Jazz, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
BLACK	.108	-.003	.113	.053	.101	.088
	.085	.086	.083	.085	.080	.081
	.038	-.001	.040	.016	.036	.027
HISPANIC	-.016	-.002	.027	.073	-.022	.030
	.115	.128	.112	.126	.108	.119
	-.004	-.000	.007	.015	-.006	.006
AGE	.004	.008	.006	.010	.002	.004
	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
	.086	.145	.123	.176	.051	.080
	a	d	c	d		b
EDUCATION	.061	.125	.038	.096	.023	.064
	.010	.012	.010	.012	.010	.012
	.237	.327	.149	.252	.090	.168
	d	d	d	d	a	d
OCCUPATION	.334	.211	.266	.215	.212	.183
	.061	.064	.059	.063	.058	.060
	.183	.094	.146	.096	.116	.082
	d	c	d	c	c	b
INCOME X 10,000	.066	.116	.055	.107	.049	.077
	.020	.021	.019	.020	.018	.019
	.111	.164	.093	.151	.082	.109
	c	d	b	d	b	d
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	.156	.204	.111	.150	.068	.133
	.064	.068	.062	.067	.060	.063
	.080	.084	.056	.062	.035	.054
	a	b		a		a
LIVES IN SMSA	.133	.071	.089	.046	.072	-.004
	.057	.060	.055	.059	.053	.056
	.070	.032	.047	.020	.038	-.002
	a					
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.089	.093	.058	.048
			.021	.021	.021	.020
			.137	.128	.088	.066
			d	d	b	a

Appendix Table 5-23 (con.)

HOME			.196	.131	.134	.018
ACTIVITIES			.032	.031	.032	.031
			.197	.125	.135	.017
				d	d	
HOURS TV/DAY					-.023	-.031
					.012	.010
					-.053	-.075
						b
ART MUSIC					.015	.093
					.023	.023
					.023	.128
						d
TV ART PROGRAMS					.131	.149
					.017	.018
					.259	.258
					d	d
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.169	.196	.224	.229	.280	.313

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-24: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Excluding Jazz, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
BLACK	-.017	-.091	-.013	-.049	-.018	-.013
	.073	.076	.071	.075	.069	.072
	-.007	-.032	-.005	-.017	-.007	-.005
HISPANIC	-.012	-.050	.018	.007	-.021	-.031
	.098	.113	.096	.112	.093	.106
	-.004	-.012	.005	.002	-.006	-.007
AGE	.006	.008	.007	.010	.004	.005
	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
	.137	.168	.168	.194	.098	.098
	d	d	d	d	b	c
EDUCATION	.056	.104	.039	.082	.026	.054
	.008	.010	.008	.011	.008	.011
	.251	.310	.177	.243	.118	.160
	d	d	d	d	b	d
OCCUPATION	.247	.214	.198	.217	.152	.187
	.052	.057	.051	.056	.050	.054
	.158	.109	.127	.110	.097	.095
	d	c	d	d	b	c
INCOME X 10,000	.066	.101	.058	.094	.052	.068
	.017	.018	.016	.018	.016	.017
	.130	.161	.115	.150	.103	.108
	d	d	c	d	b	d
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	.109	.126	.076	.085	.045	.070
	.055	.060	.054	.059	.052	.056
	.065	.059	.046	.040	.027	.033
	a	a				
LIVES IN SMSA	.085	.064	.053	.044	.038	.001
	.048	.053	.047	.052	.046	.050
	.053	.032	.033	.022	.024	.001
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.063	.069	.037	.030
			.018	.019	.018	.018
			.112	.108	.067	.047
			c	c	a	

Appendix Table 5-24 (con.)

HOME			.143	.104	.092	.006
ACTIVITIES			.028	.028	.027	.027
			.168	.113	.108	.007
			d	c	c	
HOURS TV/DAY					-.023	-.027
					.011	.009
					-.060	.076
					a	b
ART MUSIC					.023	.091
					.020	.020
					.042	.142
						d
TV ART PROGRAMS					.100	.122
					.015	.016
					.232	.241
					d	d
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.170	.191	.208	.215	.258	.297

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-25: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
BLACK	-.414	-.813	-.402	-.664	-.407	-.596
	.142	.139	.134	.132	.128	.124
	-.082	-.147	-.080	-.120	-.081	-.108
	b	d	b	d	b	d
HISPANIC	.129	-.492	.228	-.294	.131	-.369
	.192	.206	.181	.195	.171	.182
	.019	-.059	.033	-.035	.019	-.044
		a				a
AGE	-.004	-.007	.001	-.002	-.007	-.011
	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003
	-.042	-.069	.006	-.019	-.080	-.115
		a			b	d
EDUCATION	.181	.255	.132	.181	.099	.126
	.016	.019	.016	.019	.015	.018
	.391	.390	.285	.276	.213	.193
	d	d	d	d	d	d
OCCUPATION	.420	.196	.274	.207	.159	.148
	.101	.103	.096	.097	.092	.092
	.128	.051	.084	.054	.049	.039
	d		b	a		
INCOME X 10,000	.050	.129	.027	.106	.011	.055
	.033	.033	.031	.031	.029	.029
	.047	.107	.026	.087	.011	.045
		d		c		
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	-.039	-.059	-.138	-.200	-.213	-.230
	.107	.109	.101	.103	.096	.097
	-.011	-.014	-.039	-.048	-.061	-.055
					a	a
LIVES IN SMSA	.133	.035	.039	-.032	-.001	-.116
	.094	.097	.089	.091	.085	.085
	.040	.009	.011	-.008	-.000	-.030
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.207	.249	.143	.174
			.035	.033	.033	.031
			.177	.201	.122	.140
			d	d	d	d

Appendix Table 5-25 (con.)

HOME			.406	.333	.281	.142
ACTIVITIES			.052	.048	.050	.047
			.228	.186	.158	.080
			d	d	d	b
HOURS TV/DAY					-.051	-.055
					.020	.016
					-.065	-.078
					b	c
ART MUSIC					.080	.170
					.037	.035
					.068	.137
					a	d
TV ART PROGRAMS					.236	.241
					.028	.027
					.262	.245
					d	d
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.277	.288	.358	.366	.428	.448

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-26: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
BLACK	.006	-.023	.007	.001	.006	.008
	.042	.042	.042	.042	.042	.043
	.004	-.016	.005	.000	.005	.006
HISPANIC	.046	.105	.055	.134	.043	.130
	.057	.062	.056	.062	.056	.062
	.027	.048	.032	.061	.025	.059
				a		a
AGE	-.000	-.001	.000	-.000	-.001	-.001
	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
	-.011	-.056	.006	-.017	-.036	-.053
EDUCATION	.005	.022	.000	.016	-.004	.011
	.005	.006	.005	.006	.005	.006
	.047	.131	.003	.092	-.030	.065
		d		b		
OCCUPATION	.053	.020	.038	.023	.026	.020
	.030	.031	.030	.031	.030	.032
	.065	.020	.046	.023	.031	.020
INCOME X 10,000	-.014	-.013	-.016	-.015	-.018	-.019
	.010	.010	.010	.010	.010	.010
	-.052	-.041	-.061	-.047	-.068	-.059
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	.038	.033	.028	.015	.019	.013
	.032	.033	.031	.033	.032	.033
	.043	.030	.031	.014	.021	.011
LIVES IN SMSA	.001	-.056	-.009	-.064	-.014	-.072
	.028	.029	.027	.029	.028	.029
	.001	-.056	-.010	-.064	-.016	-.072
				a		a
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.018	.047	.011	.040
			.011	.011	.011	.011
			.063	.147	.036	.124
				d		c

Appendix Table 5-26 (con.)

HOME			.045	.012	.031	-.005
ACTIVITIES			.016	.015	.017	.016
			.100	.026	.068	-.010
			b			
HOURS TV/DAY					-.003	-.001
					.006	.005
					-.017	-.005
ART MUSIC					.010	.025
					.012	.012
					.035	.075
						a
TV ART PROGRAMS					.028	.016
					.009	.009
					.121	.061
					b	
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.005	.024	.016	.042	.029	.050

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-27: Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
BLACK	-.093	-.293 b	-.083	-.164	-.084	-.140
	.104	.095	.098	.089	.096	.087
	-.027	-.084	-.024	-.047	-.025	-.040
HISPANIC	.137	.020	.239	.181	.197	.133
	.140	.141	.132	.132	.130	.128
	.029	.004	.052	.034	.043	.025
AGE	-.008	-.010	-.004	-.005	-.007	-.009
	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
	-.140 d	-.062 d	-.067 a	-.079 b	-.119 c	-.142 d
EDUCATION	.056	.103	.023	.057	.009	.031
	.012	.013	.012	.013	.012	.013
	.178 d	.250 d	.075 a	.139 d	.028	.076 a
OCCUPATION	.442	.043	.343	.059	.286	.022
	.074	.071	.070	.066	.070	.065
	.200 d	.018	.156 d	.025	.130 d	.009
INCOME X 10,000	-.060	.013	-.077	-.000	-.084	-.027
	.024	.023	.023	.021	.022	.021
	-.084 a	.017	-.107 c	-.001	-.117 c	-.035
SINGLE/ DIVORCED	.203	.292	.131	.185	.099	.171
	.078	.075	.074	.070	.073	.068
	.086 b	.111 d	.055	.070 b	.042	.065 a
LIVES IN SMSA	.044	-.130 a	-.025	-.180	-.041	-.218
	.069	.066	.065	.062	.064	.060
	.019	-.054	-.011	-.074 b	-.018	-.090 c
CHILDHOOD LESSONS			.218	.246	.191	.214
			.025	.022	.025	.022
			.276 d	.316 d	.242 d	.274 c

Appendix Table 5-27 (con.)

HOME			.193	.138	.135	.050
ACTIVITIES			.038	.033	.038	.033
			.160	.123	.112	.045
			d	d	c	
HOURS TV/DAY					-.038	-.043
					.028	.011
					-.071	-.098
					a	d
ART MUSIC					.028	.033
					.028	.024
					.036	.043
TV ART PROGRAMS					.107	.139
					.021	.019
					.175	.224
					d	d
df	1007	1246	1007	1246	1007	1246
R Squared	.158	.156	.252	.267	.284	.317

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-28: Effects of Race-(Black [B]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Gender (Female [G]) for Selected Models

	18 to-31 years (N=728)			32 to 51 years (N=767)			over 51 years (N=757)		
	b	se	beta	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
D.V.: LESSONS/*									
B	.060	.209	.012	-.109	.175	-.023	-.240	.161	-.063
H	-.235	.273	-.035	-.251	.221	-.044	-.041	.283	-.006
G	.293	.122	.091(a)	.034	.097	.013	.158	.088	.075
D.V.: HOME/*									
B	.265	.106	.092(a)	.222	.119	.065	-.138	.148	-.036
H	.192	.138	.052	.178	.151	.042	.280	.260	.041
G	.256	.062	.144(d)	.215	.066	.112(b)	.187	.081	.088(a)
D.V.: TV ARTS - Model 1									
B	.132	.172	.029	-.148	.200	-.025	.179	.232	.027
H	.064	.241	.010	-.112	.260	-.014	.184	.372	.017
G	.116	.115	.037	.281	.121	.077(a)	.221	.132	.056
D.V.: TV ARTS - Model 2									
B	.312	.166	.068	-.164	.186	-.028	.143	.215	.022
H	.349	.229	.054	-.009	.243	-.001	.052	.345	.005
G	-.017	.111	-.005	.100	.114	.027	.034	.123	.009
D.V.: ART MUSIC - Model 1									
B	-.383	.121	-.117(b)	-.471	.153	-.101(b)	-.568	.169	-.113(c)
H	.252	.170	.054	-.328	.200	-.053	-.167	.271	-.020
G	.243	.081	.108(b)	.421	.093	.143(d)	.288	.096	.095(b)
D.V.: ART MUSIC - Model 2									
B	-.254	.115	-.077(a)	-.482	.147	-.103(b)	-.585	.157	-.116
H	.461	.161	.099(b)	-.266	.192	-.043	-.255	.251	-.031
G	.154	.077	.069(a)	.307	.090	.104(c)	.154	.090	.051
D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, INC. JAZZ - Model 1									
B	.081	.101	.029	-.110	.109	-.033	.085	.111	.027
H	-.157	.141	-.040	.016	.143	.004	.114	.178	.022
G	.130	.068	.069	.347	.066	.166(d)	.178	.063	.095(b)
D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, INC. JAZZ - Model 2									
B	.161	.098	.058	-.115	.105	-.035	.073	.109	.023
H	-.028	.138	-.007	.061	.137	.014	.084	.175	.017
G	.074	.066	.039	.273	.064	.131(d)	.141	.062	.075(a)
D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, INC. JAZZ - Model 3									
B	.171	.095	.061	-.033	.103	-.010	.071	.105	.023
H	-.125	.131	-.031	.066	.133	.015	.073	.166	.014
G	.085	.063	.045	.243	.063	.116(d)	.136	.059	.073(a)

Appendix Table 5-28 (con.)

D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, EXC. JAZZ - Model 1

B	-.141	.082	-.063		-.141	.097	-.048		.067	.102	.023
H	-.111	.114	-.034		-.033	.126	-.009		.027	.163	.006
G	.158	.055	.102(b)		.306	.058	.166(d)		.164	.058	.095(b)

D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, EXC. JAZZ - Model 2

B	-.086	.080	-.038		-.144	.094	-.050		.057	.101	.020
H	-.022	.113	-.007		.001	.123	.000		.003	.162	.001
G	.120	.054	.077(a)		.250	.058	.136(d)		.133	.058	.078(a)

D.V.: ATTEND PERFORMANCE, EXC. JAZZ - Model 3

B	-.065	.079	-.029		-.065	.092	-.022		.052	.097	.018
H	-.092	.109	-.029		.012	.119	.003		-.008	.154	-.002
G	.133	.053	.086(a)		.217	.056	.118(d)		.129	.055	.075(a)

D.V.: VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION - Model 1

B	-.772	.172	-.153(d)		-.750	.173	-.136(d)		-.347	.182	-.061
H	-.296	.241	-.041		-.220	.226	-.030		-.004	.291	-.000
G	.919	.115	.266(d)		1.022	.105	.293(d)		.783	.103	.230(d)

D.V.: VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION - Model 2

B	-.564	.160	-.112(c)		-.738	.164	-.134(d)		.377	.172	-.067(a)
H	.034	.224	.005		-.107	.214	-.015		-.093	.276	-.010
G	.771	.107	.223(d)		.900	.100	.258(d)		.662	.098	.195(d)

D.V.: VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION - Model 3

B	-.572	.154	-.113(c)		-.581	.157	-.105(c)		-.312	.159	-.055
H	-.114	.213	-.016		-.093	.203	-.013		-.090	.253	-.010
G	.791	.103	.229(d)		.838	.096	.240(d)		.641	.090	.188(d)

D.V.: PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 1

B	-.012	.054	-.009		-.025	.058	-.016		.020	.042	.018
H	.102	.075	.051		-.024	.076	-.012		.197	.067	.112(b)
G	.018	.036	.071		.066	.035	.068		.008	.024	.013

D.V.: PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 2

B	.011	.054	.008		-.025	.058	-.016		.019	.042	.018
H	.141	.075	.071		-.010	.076	-.005		.193	.067	.110(b)
G	.053	.036	.055		.048	.035	.049		.003	.024	.004

D.V.: PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 3

B	-.006	.054	-.004		.007	.058	.004		.008	.043	.008
H	.114	.075	.058		-.001	.075	-.001		.187	.067	.106(b)
G	.066	.036	.045		.033	.035	.034		.005	.024	.007

D.V.: NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 1

B	-.533	.143	-.137(c)		-.037	.120	-.011		.083	.090	.034
H	.103	.201	.019		-.002	.156	-.000		.265	.144	.067
G	.243	.096	.091(a)		.222	.072	.104(b)		.114	.051	.078(a)

Appendix Table 5-28 (con.)

D.V.: NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 2

B	-.349	.131	-.090(b)		-.025	.116	-.007		.073	.085	.030
H	.411	.184	.075(a)		.067	.151	.015		.224	.137	.057
G	.124	.088	.047		.160	.071	.075(a)		.054	.049	.037

D.V.: NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES - Model 3

B	-.316	.127	-.081(a)		.038	.115	.011		.079	.083	.033
H	.293	.175	.053		.067	.148	.015		.214	.131	.054
G	.162	.085	.061		.138	.070	.065(a)		.052	.047	.036

*For starred models only, respondents without data on father's and mother's education excluded, and mother's and father's educational attainment used as controls. Ns for these models are 629 for the 18-30 group, 629 for the 31-51 group, and 480 for the over 51 group. Model numbers refer to their counterparts in Appendix tables 5-14 through 5-20.
a: p less than or equal to .05; b: p less than or equal to .01;
c: p less than or equal to .001; d: p less than or equal to .001.
Analyses based on November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-29: Effects of Race (Black [B]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

D.V.	I.V.	1-11 years N=606			high school N=918		
		b	se	beta	b	se	beta
CHILDHOOD LESSONS	B	-.156	.128	-.056	.250	.178	.050
	H	-.031	.181	-.008	-.101	.234	-.017
	G	.202	.095	.094(a)	.137	.094	.051
HOME ACTIVITIES	B	.166	.093	.085	.191	.113	.061
	H	.350	.132	.127(b)	.194	.150	.049
	G	.109	.070	.072	.166	.060	.098(b)
TV ART PROGRAMS (Model 1)/*	B	.065	.150	.018	.115	.188	.021
	H	.115	.204	.024	-.172	.257	-.021
	G	.084	.114	.031	.207	.110	.062
TV ART PROGRAMS (Model 2)	B	.091	.142	.026	.139	.178	.025
	H	.182	.196	.038	.023	.257	.003
	G	-.047	.110	-.017	.083	.103	.025
ART MUSIC (Model 1)	B	-.501	.123	-.166(d)	-.241	.138	-.057
	H	-.010	.168	-.002	.103	.202	.016
	G	.160	.093	.068	.361	.081	.140(d)
ART MUSIC (Model 2)	B	-.466	.120	-.154(d)	-.206	.132	-.049
	H	.061	.164	.015	.215	.194	.034
	G	.076	.091	.032	.294	.078	.114(c)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 1)	B	-.008	.048	-.007	-.032	.085	-.013
	H	-.007	.066	-.004	-.024	.125	-.006
	G	.032	.037	.036	.214	.050	.139(d)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 2)	B	.006	.047	.005	-.022	.085	-.009
	H	.022	.065	.014	.012	.124	.003
	G	.004	.036	.004	.191	.050	.124(d)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 3)	B	.018	.047	.016	.005	.081	.002
	H	.006	.064	.004	-.016	.117	-.004
	G	.008	.036	.009	.155	.047	.101(b)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 1)	B	-.052	.044	-.050	-.162	.074	-.073(a)
	H	.056	.059	-.040	-.003	.128	-.001
	G	.049	.033	.060	.209	.043	.155(d)

Appendix Table 5-29(con.)

D.V.	I.V.	13-15 years N=389 b	se	beta	16 or more N=338 b	se	beta
CHILDHOOD LESSONS	B	-.375	.296	-.065	.133	.393	.019
	H	-.856	.359	-.121(a)	-.473	.645	-.041
	G	.159	.156	.051	.300	.167	.100
HOME ACTIVITIES	B	.193	.169	.055	.090	.266	.019
	H	.058	.205	.013	-.543	.403	-.068
	G	.438	.089	.230(d)	.412	.105	.199(d)
TV ART PROGRAMS (Model 1)/*	B	-.247	.328	-.038	-.096	.470	-.011
	H	.228	.413	.028	-1.003	.901	-.059
	G	.187	.180	.051	.714	.233	.167(b)
TV ART PROGRAMS (Model 2)	B	.011	.317	.002	.034	.443	.004
	H	.530	.401	.064	-.475	.846	-.028
	G	-.046	.177	-.013	.412	.224	.096
ART MUSIC (Model 1)	B	-.693	.259	-.131(b)	-.666	.302	-.110(a)
	H	-.200	.326	-.030	-1.068	.579	-.092
	G	.577	.142	.194(d)	.330	.150	.113(a)
ART MUSIC (Model 2)	B	-.441	.247	-.083	-.565	.295	-.093
	H	.123	.312	.018	-.802	.567	-.069
	G	.396	.138	.133(b)	.184	.150	.063
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 1)	B	-.137	.208	-.034	.156	.299	.027
	H	-.126	.262	-.024	-.862	.572	-.079
	G	.380	.114	.165	.653	.148	.238(d)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 2)	B	.035	.202	.008	.279	.289	.049
	H	.115	.256	.022	-.546	.555	-.050
	G	.290	.113	.126(a)	.475	.147	.173(b)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, INCLUDING JAZZ (Model 3)	B	.106	.192	.026	.310	.278	.054
	H	.039	.241	.008	-.427	.529	-.039
	G	.277	.108	.120(a)	.388	.140	.141(b)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 1)	B	-.246	.180	-.069	-.069	.263	-.014
	H	-.122	.227	-.027	-.848	.503	-.088
	G	.366	.099	.183(c)	.552	.130	.229(d)

Appendix Table 5-29 (con.)

D.V.	I.V.	1-11 years			high school		
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 2)	B	-.041	.043	-.039	-.157	.073	-.071(a)
	H	-.034	.059	-.024	-.022	.107	-.007
	G	.027	.033	.033	.192	.043	.143(d)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 3)	B	-.029	.043	-.028	-.125	.071	-.057
	H	-.047	.058	-.033	-.003	.102	-.001
	G	.030	.033	.037	.162	.041	.121(d)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.456	.120	-.151(c)	-.857	.177	-.157(d)
	H	-.068	.163	-.017	-.301	.260	-.037
	G	.559	.090	.235(d)	1.041	.104	.313(d)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.429	.113	-.142(c)	-.801	.167	-.147(d)
	H	-.015	.155	-.004	-.129	.245	-.016
	G	.462	.086	.195(d)	.942	.098	.283(d)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	-.376	.110	-.125(c)	-.742	.158	-.136(d)
	H	-.059	.149	-.014	-.174	.228	-.021
	G	.464	.083	.196(d)	.891	.092	.268(d)
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.034	.037	-.040	.082	.043	.065
	H	.101	.051	.086(a)	.149	.064	.078(a)
	G	.009	.028	.013	.014	.025	.018
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.026	.037	-.030	.087	.043	.069(a)
	H	.119	.051	.101(a)	.161	.064	.085(a)
	G	-.005	.028	-.007	.007	.025	.009
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	-.045	.038	-.052	.080	.044	.063
	H	.113	.051	.096(a)	.159	.063	.084(a)
	G	.001	.029	.001	.001	.026	.001
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.118	.072	-.067	-.360	.115	-.106(b)
	H	.150	.098	.063	-.027	.168	-.005
	G	.119	.055	.086(a)	.103	.067	.049
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.060	.065	-.034	-.308	.107	-.090(b)
	H	.268	.089	.112(b)	.097	.157	.019
	G	.032	.050	.023	.041	.062	.020
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	-.055	.065	-.031	-.270	.106	-.079(a)
	H	.247	.088	.103(b)	.081	.153	.016
	G	.037	.049	.027	.031	.062	.015

Appendix Table 5-29(con.)

D.V.	I.V.	13-15 years			16 or more		
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 2)	B	-.113	.177	-.032	.022	.258	.004
	H	.077	.223	.017	-.617	.495	-.064
	G	.317	.099	.158(b)	.421	.131	.175(b)
PERFORMING-ARTS ATTENDANCE, EXCLUDING JAZZ (Model 3)	B	-.045	.168	-.013	.066	.248	.013
	H	.015	.211	.003	-.497	.472	-.052
	G	.300	.094	.150(b)	.343	.125	.143(b)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.931	.289	-.156(b)	-.554	.352	-.082
	H	-.251	.364	-.033	-.874	.675	-.067
	G	1.205	.158	.360(d)	1.089	.175	.334(d)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.640	.276	-.110(a)	-.426	.339	-.063
	H	-.656	.349	.013	-.531	.651	-.041
	G	1.009	.155	.301(d)	.906	.173	.277(d)
VISUALLY ORIENTED CONSUMPTION ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	-.506	.260	-.085	-.383	.321	-.057
	H	.011	.327	.001	-.373	.609	-.029
	G	.947	.146	.282(d)	.790	.162	.242(d)
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.069	.096	-.038	-.166	.138	-.066
	H	-.061	.121	-.026	-.196	.264	-.041
	G	.098	.053	.095	.165	.068	.136(a)
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.017	.096	-.009	-.153	.138	-.061
	H	.011	.122	.005	-.158	.265	-.033
	G	.069	.054	.067	.146	.061	.120(a)
PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	.009	.095	.005	-.108	.138	-.043
	H	-.009	.120	-.004	-.096	.263	-.020
	G	.056	.054	.054	.131	.070	.108
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 1)	B	-.249	.225	-.054	-.149	.293	-.028
	H	-.048	.283	-.008	-.348	.562	-.033
	G	.374	.123	.145(b)	.411	.145	.157(b)
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 2)	B	-.011	.213	-.002	-.055	.283	-.010
	H	.286	.269	.049	-.091	.544	-.009
	G	.253	.119	.098(a)	.276	.144	.105
NONPERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES (Model 3)	B	.057	.207	.012	.043	.273	.008
	H	.231	.260	.040	.052	.520	.005
	G	.242	.116	.094(a)	.200	.138	.076

*/ For starred analyses only, cases without information on mother's or father's education were omitted and controls for mother's and father's education were included. For these models, Ns are 365 for

1-11 years, 717 for high school graduate, 352 for 13-15 years, and 317 for 16 or more years.
Model numbers refer to their counterparts in Appendix tables 5-14 through 5-20. a=p less than or equal to .05; b=p less than or equal to .01; c=p less than or equal to .001; d=p less than or equal to .0001. Results based on analyses of November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5-30: Coefficients Representing Effects of Black (B) and Hispanic (H) on Core Participation Items (1) with Race/Ethnicity only (2) with Demographic Controls for November/December 1982 Subsample

		jazz		classical		opera		musical		play	
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B	b	.745	1.039	-.931	-.513	1.188	-.953	-.961	-.501	-.930	-.436
	se	.185	.207	.295	.319	.920	.934	.229	.246	.296	.318
	sig	b	c	a	NS	NS	NS	c	a	a	NS
H	b	.030	.223	-1.790	-1.275	-.725	-.374	-.601	-.056	-1.164	-.547
	se	.331	.351	.638	.654	1.079	1.098	.291	.312	.479	.499
	sig	NS	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	a	NS	a	NS

		ballet		art		instrument		act, sing		read	
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B	b	-1.660	-1.422	-1.032	-.730	-.024	.078	.034	.129	-.883	-.564
	se	.729	.741	.216	.236	.351	.365	.324	.339	.136	.157
	sig	a	NS	c	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	b
H	b	-.333	.044	-.472	-.008	.207	.410	.644	.863	-.713	-.282
	se	.574	.597	.257	.282	.456	.474	.363	.384	.192	.219
	sig	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	a	b	NS

NOTES: b is the logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant.